

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1920.

THE MSS. OF CALLIMACHVS' *HYMNS*.

(Continued.)

II. S, Q, AND q.

S¹ is Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, gr. 24; foll. 136 (paper); size folio, with thirty-two lines usually to the page; dated 1464. Contents: f. 2, a Life of Musaeus (differing from Suidas), followed by 'Αντιπάτρου σιδωνίου (sic, for Θεσσαλονικέως) εἰς ἡρώ καὶ λέανδρον (*Anth. Dübner*, VII. 666) and Musaeus, *Hero and Leander*. 7^v, two poems by Marcus Musurus, viz. a version of Musaeus' poem in ten hexameter lines and four elegiac couplets εἰς μουσαῖον. 8^r, three epigrams on Orpheus (*Anth. Düb.* VII. 8-10), written as one. 8^v, Constantine Lascaris εἰς τὰ προλεγόμενα τοῦ σοφοῦ ὀρφέως. 10^v, περὶ ποιητοῦ, on the life and writings of Orpheus (quite different from Suidas' Life). 11^r, ὑπόθεσις τοῦ πλοῦ τῶν ἀργοναυτικῶν (sic). 11^v, ὑπόθεσις τοῦ δέρου. 12, Orpheus, *Argonautica*, with frequent marginal notes, and corrections in red ink, in Lascaris' hand. 35, Orpheus, *Hymns*, prefaced by the invocation to Musaeus, 'Ορφεὺς πρὸς μουσαῖον εὐτυχῶς χρῶ ἑταίρε (Μάνθανε δὲ μουσαίε θνητολὴν περὶ σεμνὴν κτλ.); of the *Hymns* are given (Abel) II.; VI.; VIII.; XXXII.; XL. 1-4 (5-20 omitted), and two additional lines (καὶ θνητοῖσι βροτοῖς ὅσοι χθόνα ναιετάουσι | ἐλθὲ μάκαρ σκιρτητὰ φέρων πολὺ γῆθος ἄπασιν, not in Abel); LII.; LIII.; LXIX. (or LXX.); LXXX.; LXXXVII.; then (ff. 52^v-55) Proclus, *Hymns* (Ludwich) I.; II.; III.; V.; VI.; VII.; finally, in Lascaris' hand, στίχοι, αττα. 56-83, *Homeric Hymns*, III.-XXXIII., lacking XX. 8. 84^r-100^v, Callimachus, *Hymns*, followed by κτῆμα κωνσταντίνου λασκάρεως ἐν μεδιολάνῳ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐκγραφέν· ᾱ ὕ ξ δ. [i.e. 1464]. 101^r, γένος καλλιμάχου (a summary of Suidas), ending with εὐρηνται δὲ καὶ τινα ἐπιγράμματα εἰς τὸν πρῶτον καλλιμάχον ἀδέσποτα οὕτως ἔχοντα: and two epigrams

¹ See Joannes Iriarte, *Regiae Bibliothecae Matritimsis Codices Graeci MSS.* (Madrid, 1769), pp. 86-120; Sikes and Allen, *Homeric Hymns*, p. XII;

A. Ludwich, *Endocia* . . . , p. 123 For the *Homeric Hymns* it is T; for Proclus, G.

follow, inscribed εἰς καλλιμάχον ἀδέσποτα (*Anth. Düb.* VII. 41 and 42). 101^r-134, a collection of over 450 Greek epigrams, all but 27 of which Iriarte found printed in the *Anthology* or its Appendix; they begin with some of Callimachus' (ff. 101^r-102^v), in this order (Wilamowitz' numeration)—XXI. (entitled καλλιμάχον εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα); XXII. 1-3 (headed τοῦ αὐτοῦ), with an unlocated distich added (ἀγαλὸν υἱὲ φίλος δὲ καὶ ἐν ξείνῃ κεκάλυφαι· ἢ παρ τὸδε πρωτῆος κράσπεδον αἰγυαλοῦ); II. (with τοῦ αὐτοῦ πάντα in the margin); XIX. (headed εἰς νέους καὶ νέας) and an ἀδέσποτον (*Anth. Düb.* VII. 558) together; XVII.; XVIII.; XVI. and *Anth. Düb.* VII. 729 together; XV.; XIV.; XI.; X.; VII.; VIII.; XXIV. (entitled εἰς ἡετίωνα); Apollonius' epigram on Callimachus (*Anth. Düb.* XI. 275); IX.; XII.; IV. (headed εἰς τίμωνα τὸν μισάνθρωπον); XX.; XXVI.; XXV. No marks of gatherings occur in the Callimachean portion, unless δ in the top left corner of f. 91^r be one. Three, or perhaps four, hands can be traced in the *Hymns*. The text-hand is neat and rather small. ρ almost entirely ousts γ; ρ sometimes in ligature closely resembles λ. Ligature is very frequent, especially in ερ and ερι (both semi-superscript), εσ, υι, ρι; the contraction for στ is common; and -ων and (very rarely) -ου, -εν, -ον appear as superscript contractions. Unabbreviated superscript terminations are -αι, -αις, -αν, -ες, -η, -οι, -ον, -ος, -ους, -ω, which all occur only very seldom. An accent is often written continuously with α, υ, or ω; breathings are often dubious, being mere dots; *iota subscr.* is fairly frequent, both in the original text and by additions. As in Q and q, a comma is often placed after ὁ μὲν, ἡ μὲν, οἱ μὲν, etc., and once after οἱ δὲ; and we find in III. 2 τῇ, τόξα (SQ), in IV. 203 ὃ, τοι (SQ), in V. 111 ὃ, τε (SQq). The horizontal superscript stroke, marking a personal name, occurs but rarely; it is used wrongly by a later hand at I. 50 (ἐξαπιναιῖα), II. 92 (σίνιν), III. 68 (μυχάτοιο), IV. 224 (πανερρχομένην), and V. 20 (δινᾶν).

Q¹ is Modena, Estensis aW 5. 16;² foll. 92 (paper), cmm. 29.5×21.3, with twenty-five lines to the page; cent. XV.³ Contents: ff. 1-26 (excluding 11), Orpheus, *Hymns πρὸς Μουσαῖον*, with marginal and interlinear scholia; and Proclus, *Hymns* I.-V., assigned to Orpheus.⁴ 11^r, in Valla's hand, but written in different ink from the text of the *Hymns*, ll. 29-62 of Orpheus, *Lithica*, omitting ll. 54-7 and with lacunae at ll. 30, 53. 11^v, probably not in Valla's writing, 'Αλβέρτου πίου καρπαίων ἀρχοντος κτήμα, and a Latin index of the contents, viz. *Orphei ad musaeum hymni, Callimachi hymni, Homeri hymni*. 26-27, Proclus, *Hymns* VI.-VII.; then Orpheus, *frag.* VI. ll. 10-43 (*apud* Mullach I. pp. 168-9), and beneath, *proptertius | Intonet arguto pectore calimachus*.⁵ 28^r-49^r, Callimachus, *Hymns*, with marginal and interlinear

¹ See V. Puntoni, *Indice de' codici greci della biblioteca Estense di Modena*, in *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, Florence, IV. (1896), pp. 487-8; Nigra, *l.c.*, pp. 216 sqq.; and Hollander in *Jahrbh. f. Philol.*, 1892, p. 544; Ludwich, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

² Formerly III. E. 11 and 164. The Librarian

of the Bibl. Estense kindly informed me of the change in designation. For *Homeric Hymns* it is E; for Callimachus Wilamowitz calls it q (Schneider did not know it); for Proclus it is B.

³ Nigra, *l.c.*, says it was written towards the end of cent. XV.

⁴ See Ludwich, *l.c.*

⁵ Proptertius II. 1, 40.

scholia. mostly in (Hom. *Eph.* ὁ οὐάλλα 85-6, Orphi which with δὲ ἐστι, κ p. 457^a, Dūb. (sic). 92^r, οἱ τὰ ὁμήρου attributed ἡρώων κοσμ εἰς μουσαῖον stamped in the ducal indicated K tenth folio, words of t been inter marginalia- script, in w and υ to υ from the t frequently i used consis to distinguish margin. N of the inte written in a finger-posts quaintly in

q³ is M (paper), cm Contents: 59-79^r, Orp 69^r marg. an in marg.; 2

¹ Cf. II, F, a ² -s at the end of the text, once in

³ See E. M. *Codicum Graecorum* (1906); Nigra, *l.c.*

scholia. 50^r-84^v, *Homeric Hymns* III.-XXXIII., with a few marginal notes, mostly in Greek, but some in Latin; at end of 84^r an epigram, εἰς ξένους (Hom. *Epigr.* I. Baum.);¹ and at end of 84^v Valla's signature in red: γεώργιος ὁ οὐάλλα <βάλλας ex corr.> πλακεντίνος <πλακεντίνος ex corr.> ἔγραψε. 85-6, Orpheus, *Hymns* XLI.-XLV. 87-91^r, blank. 91^v, 14 lines of glosses, which with those on 92 are 'uariis recentioribus m. exarata,' beginning ἀγνέως δὲ ἐστὶ, κίων . . . σὺ μέμνησό μου (scholia on Aristophanes, *Wasps*, 875, p. 457^a, Dübner), and ending σημαίνει δὲ καὶ ἔργον τέ τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μουσέως (sic). 92^r, 40 lines of glosses on the Homeridae and Homer, beginning ὁμηρίδαι οἱ τὰ ὁμήρου ὑποκρινόμεναι . . ., and containing the epitaph on Homer's tomb attributed to Proclus (Ἐνθάδε τὴν ἱερὰν κεφαλὴν κατὰ γαῖα καλύπτει· ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων κοσμήτορα θεῖον ὁμηρον. προκλος), and ending γογίας (sic) δὲ ὁ λεοντίνος εἰς μουσαῖον αὐτὸν ἀνάγει. The book is bound in leather; on the back, stamped in gold, are (above) the inscription *Orphaeus hymni etc.*, and (below) the ducal arms of Modena. The pages are not numbered. Gatherings are indicated by catch-words, written vertically at the foot of the verso of every tenth folio, in the same hand and ink as the text, and consisting of the first words of the next folio. They point to a division into quinions, f. 11 having been intercalated. All the writing—text, interlinear corrections and glosses, *marginalia*—is in the same hand, a bold, rather crabbed but not unpleasing script, in which -σ almost completely ousts -ς.² ε is often closely alike to η, and υ to ν; both η and μ are used. Contractions are almost entirely absent from the text (-ων twice; -ου and -ον once each; ἀνόλοι once), but occur frequently in the scholia. αρ, επ, ει, and στ are ligatured. *Iota subscr.* is not used consistently. The rough and smooth breathings are sometimes difficult to distinguish. About one-third of the width of each page is given to the margin. Nearly all the notes there, most of the interlinear glosses, and many of the interlinear corrections of the text are, in the Callimachean portion, written in a different ink from the text itself. Letters are sometimes used as finger-posts to point from text to margin, a practice which made q stumble quaintly in copying III. 127.

q³ is Milan, Ambrosianus 11 (A 63 sup.), formerly V 365; foll. III+III⁴ (paper), cmm. 21, 8×16, with thirty-three lines to the page; cent. XVI.⁵ Contents: ff. 1-58, Orpheus, *Argonautica*, with marginal and interlinear scholia. 59-79^r, Orpheus, *Hymns* I. (with introductory lines) to XL., XLVI. (twice, 69^r marg. and 71^v) to LXXXVII. (XV. comprises 11 ll.+5 in marg.; XVII., 10+9 in marg.; XL. 22, i.e. 1-20 with 7-8 of XLV.; LIX. 21; LXV. 9). 79^v-82^r,

¹ Cf. II, F, and At.

² -ς at the end of a line occurs only thrice in the text, once in a suprascript correction.

³ See E. Martini and D. Bassi, *Catalogus Codicum Graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae* (Milan, 1906); Nigra, *l.c.*, pp. 204-5; Schneider, *Praef.*,

XXXI. For Proclus it is D.

⁴ Ff. 58, 82^v, 83^v, 106^v, 110^r, 111^r are partly blank.

⁵ So the Ambrosian Catalogue, dating it 1509 (from f. 111^v); Nigra, *l.c.*, p. 204, ascribes it to the end of cent. XV.

Proclus, *Hymns* I.-VII., seemingly assigned to Orpheus by the scribe.¹ 82^v, +εὐδία ὀρφική θεολογία: ~ (Ζεὺς πρῶτος γένητο κτλ.—ἐξ ἱερῆς κραδῆς κτλ. [Abel, *frag.* 46, p. 167]); then τέλος τῶν ὕμνων ὀρφέως ποιητοῦ: ~ 83, +ἔτεροι ὕμνοι τοῦ αὐτοῦ ποιητοῦ ὀρφέως: ~ sc. XLI.-XLV., with τέλος at the end. 84-9, blank. 90^r-106^v, Callimachus, *Hymns*, with marginal and interlinear scholia; at the end Τέλος+. 107-9, blank. 110^r, <O> παύσας χ<ριστ> ἐ τῆς χειρὸς μου τὸν δρόμον: παύσον καὶ τὸν δρόμον μοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας. 110^v, <Nicetae Serranum episc. quae feruntur> nomina <seu potius epitheta> deorum;² and in top of margin, somewhat cut, αὐτ<η> ἡ δέλτος, περιέχει ποιητὰς δ' εὐριπίδιον σοφοκλήν, ἡσίοδον καὶ ἀριστοφάνην (the two last words faded). 111^r, partly blank. 111^v, +ἀφθ [1509]· ὁκτωβρίῳ κβ. ἐν οἰκίᾳ κυροῦ μανουήλ τοῦ πουλλομάτου· παρόντες οἱ ἐνδοθεν καὶ καταγεγραμμένοι ἦγουν τὰ δύο μέρη· καὶ οἱ ἀξιόπιστοι μάρτυρες παρακληθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν μερῶν· ἐν ὀνόματι τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ζωαρχικῆς τριάδος· διὰ μακροῦ χρόνου καὶ . . . ἔχοντα διένεξιν· καὶ ὅχλησες οὐκ ὀλίγας καὶ κρίσεις καὶ ζητήσεις πολλὰς· ἐνώπιον τῆς αὐθεντίας κτλ. κἀγὼ μυχῶν σουλιάρδ<ος>³ παρακληθ<ει>ς ὑπὸ τῶν δύο μερῶν τῶν ἄνωθεν· τοῦ τε κύρ κανάκ<η> καὶ τῆς κυρ<ίας> ἀμπελάς τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀδελφῆς· ἔγραψα καὶ ὑπεσφαλῆ γα . . . This manuscript belonged to J. V. Pinelli (1535-1601)⁴ before it came into the Ambrosian Library. It is bound in wood, with a back of leather. There are no indications of gatherings. The writing, which is all in the same hand, is small and not very easy to read. Ligatures and contractions abound in both text and scholia.

The close kinship between S, Q, and q is shown by the following readings, selected from among ninety in which this trio unite against all the other manuscripts:

	SQq.	cett.
I. 17	χυντώσαιτο	χυντώσαιτο
23	ὥκμησεν	ὥκχησεν, -ε: ὠέχησεν
74	γεώμορος	γεωμόρος
94	αἰθις	αἰθι: αἰθι.
II. 49	ἐπ' ἔρωτι	ὑπ' ἔρωτι
109	συφερτὸν	συρφετὸν
III. 4	ἀρχόμενοι καὶ ὅτε	ἀρχόμενοι (ἀρχόμενος: ἀρχόμεν') ὥς ὅτε
51	ἀνὰ	αἰνὰ
97	ἐπ' ἰσχιον	ἐπ' ἰχνιον
102	κεράδων	κεράων

¹ See Ludwich, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

² Ambrosian Catalogue, with a reference to Bassi in *Bollettino di Filol. Class.* IV., pp. 32-4.

³ Of Nauplia, who lived about 1475 (Nigra, *l.c.*, p. 204, who says that q has all the faults characteristic of the books which issued from Suliardo's workshop). He was an Argive (ἐκ χῶρας τῶν ἀργείων, subscription to *Mut.* III. C. 6).

⁴ Cf. *z*. He wrote Ambrosian 629 (P 78 sup.; formerly S 556), described thus in the *Catalogus*: "«Ex»ercitum «en»ta utriusque linguae «sc. gr. lat.» Vincentii Pinelli sed praesertim Graecae." Passim sunt uero notulae uarii generis, nullius tamen momenti. Inter alios adferuntur loci Aristophanis, Callimachi, Euripidis, Homeri, et Thucydidis."

121
158
IV. 50
97
147
191
225
255
282
303
309
325
V. 104
VI. 16
17
126

SQq,
homoeograph
ζεῦρα μὲν
ἡ τεύφρα q

Before
complex c
The C
Giorgio V
used for th
(a) TH
(b) TH
names.
(c) In
(d) At
(θαύμαντοσ
(e) At
variations
[δαροι . . .
[ὁ ἀριστῆς;
λόγοι εἰσὶν

¹ I, 5 ἀμφι
25 θηρία (q omi
ἦρη for βελγ in
χελρονος τοῦ κε
(clipped on n
ρου q). S has
caris' hand.

	SQq.	cett.
	121 τὸν τρίτον	τὸ τρίτον : τοτρίτον
	158 ἔνεπε	ἐνεπεν
IV.	50 μυκαλισίδες	μυκαλησίδες : μυκαλισσίδες
	97 ἔλαχες	ἐλλαχες
	147 ἄρα βοσάκεος	ἄραβος σάκεος
	191 ὕδασι	ὑδατι
	225 αὐτὴν	αὐτῇ
	255 ἔκθορε αἶ δ'	ἐκθορεν αἶ δ'
	282 πολυχρωνιώτατον	πολυχρονιώτατον
	303 ἀμφιβόητος	ἀμφιβόητον
	309 εἴσατο	εἴσατο : εἴσατο
	325 ἰστίης	ἰστίη : ἰστίη
V.	104 λίνους	λίνα : λῖνα : λίναν
VI.	16 ἄποτος καὶ	ἄποτός (ἄποπός) τε καὶ
	17 ἡγαγον	ἡγαγε
	126 φέροντι	φέρουντι : φερόντι

SQq, like ABCK, omit II. 27, without indicating a lacuna, through *homoeographon*. At IV. 39, where *Ee* have ὄφρα μὲν, *cett.* τόφρα μὲν, SQq give ζεύρα μὲν (μεν Q), and they alone have a marginal gloss (ἡ τέφρα SQ : ἡ τεύφρα q).

Before we can see the inter-relation of these three manuscripts, the complex condition of S and Q requires description.

The Callimachean portion of Q is entirely the work of one hand, that of Giorgio Valla. Besides the fabric of the text itself there are, in the darker ink used for the text :

(a) The internal corrections natural to a careful scribe.

(b) Thirteen marginal 'reminders' of unusual words, especially proper names.

(c) In *Hymn* I. four scholia and one variant, shared with S.¹

(d) At IV. 67, besides the stock scholium ἡ ἱρις, a marginal note (θαύμαντος κόρα ἡ ἱρις) found elsewhere only in q.

(e) At V. 66, another marginal note,² also shared only with q, whose variations I give in brackets: δαροι | plato in minoe super hoc uersu homeri [δαροι . . . homeri omitted] ἐννέωρος βασιλεὺς [βασιλεὺς] διὸς μεγάλου δαριστήος, [ὁ δαριστής,] inquit [ἔφη,] συνουσιαστήν τοῦ διὸς εἶναι τὸν μίνων· οἱ γὰρ δαροι λόγοι εἰσὶν [-] καὶ δαριστήος [ὁ ἀριστής] συνουσιαστήος ἔστιν [ἔστιν] ἐν λόγοις.

¹ I. 5 ἀμφίλογον (q): 14 οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἀρκάδες (q): 25 θηρία (q omits): 28 γρ' ῥέη S, ῥέη Q (SQq have ἡρῆ for ῥέη in text: q omits the variant): 36 μῦθ' οὐ χείρονος τοῦ κενταύρου S, μῦθ' οὐ χείρονος τοῦ κενταύρου (clipped on margin) Q (μῦθ' οὐ χείρονος τοῦ κενταύρου q). S has all these in the text ink and Lascaris' hand. The scholia on I. 5, 14, 36 are

from the common stock; at 25 *cett.* have a longer gloss.

² Valla is the writer of a manuscript containing Plato's *Critias*, *Timaeus*, *Minos*, and *Definitions*, which is now in the Regia Biblioteca Estense; see T. W. Allen, *Notes upon Greek Manuscripts in Italian Libraries* (1890), p. 11, No. 89.

Written in lighter ink, and with a finer pen, are—

(f) Some internal corrections of the text.

(g) A large body of marginal and interlinear scholia.

(h) In *Hymn I.* a few scholia, shared with S.¹

As for S—besides the writing of C. Lascaris, it seems to bear the marks of some other hands, which will be discussed in detail later. The text and its corrections apart, Lascaris himself gives us the two sets of scholia, already mentioned as shared with Q; 35 other scholia, also brief;² and 29 marginal 'reminders'.³

I believe Q to be a copy of S. I can find no evidence against this belief; but, in view of the complexity that both these manuscripts finally reached, its demonstration is not a simple matter. I shall first set forth arguments against the converse position; then will follow a statement of the direct evidence for my theory, which will, I hope, also dispose of the possibility that S and Q could be brothers or cousins.⁴ This evidence given, it will remain to account for the later accretions in both S and Q. The acceptance of the direct evidence ought reasonably to justify my attitude towards the indeterminable features of the text of S. Some alterations there, notably in breathing, accent, and the addition of *iota subscr.*, cannot confidently be ascribed to any particular hand. But, if we find cogent direct evidence that Q is a copy of S, and nothing outside these corrections to contradict it, then we may fairly regard as having existed in S, before Q was copied, those among these corrections whose resultant occurs also (in faultless script) in Q,⁵ and consider the rest as the work of later hands.

¹ In S these are in the text hand but in a lighter ink. They are I. 17 καθάρματα: 17 ἀπολούσαιο: 18 and 26 ποταμός ἀρκαδίας: 25 κινώπεδα: 34 σπήλαιον: 35 ἔθρεψε. At 35 ἔθρεψε was corrected later to -αν in S: -ε had probably arisen from a misreading of the sign for αν. At I. 42 S has πόλις καὶ ἄλσος in the text ink, Q in lighter ink but from the text pen, which suggests that Valla overlooked it in copying the text-ink series from S.

² These are I. 1 εἰη: 22 δρύς: 25 καταδόσεις: 25 κινώπεδα altered to -ετα, and τὰ ἐν τῷ πέδῳ κινούμενα θηρία added before the change: 33 νῖα (on ὦνα): 57 παῖς νέος: 66 θεόν: 72 μικροῖς: 74 γεωργός: 76 ὑμνοῦμεν: 77 κυνήγ (sic): 84 βέδσιν ἀφένον, repeated in margin, where stands also βυθηφόνην βέδσιν φόνου: 90 ἀνέδην φ+(?). II. 19 καὶ λυκωρε+(?): 20 θρηνεί: 21 πρόσφθεγμα καταφωαίντος: 23 (for 24) τῆς νύβης: 32 περόνη: 42 βοηθός: 45 ψῆφοι μαρτικάλ: 50 blurred: 70 μάντικον: 89 blurred (? - + φρήσον): 92 ἡ κυρήγη ἡ τοῦ ὑψέως: 94 ὅσα. III. 3 παλίζειν: 45 ὁπαδοῦς ἐκ τοῦ ἄμα ὁρούεσθαι: 62 ἐτλησαν: 112 ἐλάφοις: 114 λαίλαψ: 155 (for 154) νεβροῦς. IV. 12 λάροις: 36 ἦν (rather a correction of δι' ὧσι than a scholium). V. 76 μελανίζων. Of these, except in so far as they form part of longer scholia,

Q has only γεωργός (I. 74); and there and at II. 92 (where he has only ἡ κυρήγη) he agrees with E, from some kinsman of which, as we shall see later, he derives most of his scholia and also some corrections of his text. Of S's marginal reminders he reproduces only ὥαριον (III. 265). These reminders and the thirty-five scholia, though all are undoubtedly from Lascaris' hand, appear in inks of various hues; and their lettering, while in all cases paralleled in some part or parts of the text itself, is also varied, so that Valla may well have formed a hasty judgment that they were not authentic enough for admission to his carefully select text (for the working of this principle in the matter of textual additions, see below, p. 70).

³ But one (περὰ τρυφῆς, IV. 314) may be meant as a scholium.

⁴ Which is held, at least as regards the *Homeric Hymns*, by Allen (who makes them brothers; see *J.H.S.* XV. 1895, p. 163) and H. Hollander (in *Hermes*, 1891, pp. 170 sqq.).

⁵ With two qualifications; for we shall find a few changes in S that were perhaps made by Valla, and a few other corrections of both S and Q (e.g. at V. 17) have reached each independently.

Ag
(i.)
deteriora
14 of in
4 others
have ma
ὁσεν το
(ii.)
(c) and
attains h
11 times
text in
different
Callima
added (a
copied—
The
(i.)

(ii.)

¹ These
cannot in
does not
both S and
(S from σ
² Under
discussed

Against S as a copy of Q the following difficulties may be urged:

(i.) A comparison of the original texts of S and Q shows considerable deterioration in Q, viz. 17 cases of permutation of letters; 27 of omission, and 14 of insertion, of letters; 1 of misdivision, 2 of non-division, of words; and 4 others. It is incredible that even so able a scholar as C. Lascaris could have made *all* these errors good, especially the changes from η to $\eta\varsigma$ (III. 190), $\delta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ to $\delta\varsigma$ *κεν* (V. 53), $\acute{\iota}\nu'$ *οἱ* to $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ *οἱ* (V. 63), $\epsilon\ddot{\upsilon}$ $\epsilon\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta$ to $\epsilon\ddot{\upsilon}\tau\epsilon$ $\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta$ (sic V. 129).

(ii.) Of the features of Q, (a) to (f), that have been described above, S has (c) and (h); and in (a) it presents faultlessly 102 of the 103 readings which Q attains by correction.¹ But it lacks (d), (e) and (g); and in (f), while S shows 11 times the resultant of Q's corrections, in 16 cases Valla starts from Lascaris' text in making his changes, and 4 times he supplements a lacuna with a different reading from that which a later hand supplies in S.² If we take the Callimachean *Hymns* in S to be a copy of Q, we thereby assume that Valla added (d), (e), (g), and most of the discordant parts of (f) to Q after S was copied—surely a rather improbable event.

The direct evidence for Q as a copy of S is as follows:

(i.) *Readings.*

II. 54 $\mu\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\tau\acute{o}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ (sic) S : $\mu\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\tau\acute{o}\chi\omicron\sigma$ Q.

S has corrected $\mu\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\tau\rho\acute{o}\phi\omicron\varsigma$, whose traces are still visible, in such a way that κ superimposed on ϕ resembles χ : hence Q's text, in which a later attempt to make $-\lambda\acute{o}\chi\omicron\sigma$ has been erased. The complexity of S could not have come from copying Q.

III. 182 $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\tau\alpha\varsigma$ S : $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma$ Q.

Q has misread as η , which it resembles in S's script, the supine ς with which S corrects the ligature for $\sigma\tau$. Lascaris could not possibly have taken Valla's η to be ς .

V. 80 $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ $\acute{o}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ (corrected from $-\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$) S : $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\acute{o}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{\omega}\sigma$ (corrected from $-\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$) Q.

Q has expanded the double accent (for which see p. 12, note 1, above) to make a second $\tau\omicron\nu$. The converse contraction, from $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ to $\tau\acute{o}\nu$, on Lascaris' part I find incredible.

(ii.) *Accents and Breathings.*

Lascaris' frequent practice of writing an accent continuously with α , υ , or ω has the result that his acute and circumflex accents are sometimes closely alike; hence probably such errors by Valla as $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ (III. 52). And Lascaris' breathings are often mere dots; in such cases Valla often gives the wrong breathing.

¹ These all concern quite trivial points, and cannot independently counter my view that S does not come from Q. The remaining reading both S and Q got by correction—III. 201 $\sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (S from $\sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\nu$, Q from $\sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\nu$).

² Under (f) come also IV. 167, 300, both discussed below; and III. 99, where, though

$\pi\rho\omicron\mu\omicron\lambda\eta\varsigma$ in S has μ with a long stem, followed by an undeniable \omicron , Q gives $\pi\rho\omicron\kappa\alpha\lambda\eta\sigma$, and later sets μ above κ in lighter ink and finer pen.

³ A later hand produces $\tau\omicron\nu$ (sic). Probably Valla made the change to $\acute{o}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ in both manuscripts.

Valla is probably responsible for two corrections in *S*, and perhaps for two others. At IV. 167 *S* has *μακηδότικοι ρανέσθαι* (*sic*, with traces of an erased rough breathing over *ρ*), *Q* *μακηδότικοι ρανέσθαι* (with *ιρ* joined and breathing erased);¹ at IV. 213, where both *S* and *Q* give *ἐπλώουσα*, *S* has *πι* in darker ink and thicker strokes (such as Valla used) than the context, and these two letters are ligatured in both manuscripts. At III. 50 Valla has *ποσειδάωνι* (*ω* in text's ink and pen), and may have made the correction in *S* from *-ο-* to *-ω-*; and at IV. 221, where he gives *εἶσεται*, it may well have been he who erased from *εἶσεται* of *S* the *τ* whose traces are still visible.

Twice Valla appears to have resorted to conjecture. At V. 32 *Q* has *πέξητε* (*S* clearly *-αι*); at V. 63, *ἴν' οἱ* (unmetrical: *S* *ἴνα οἱ*).²

Some interesting features shared by *S* and *Q* may be noted here. They alone give *Καλιμάχον* in the general title of the *Hymns*; and the following doublets occur in them alone, or only with *q*: I. 88 *νοήσει* (*q*); III. 78 *κόρσιν* (*-ην q*); III. 237 *ἀμαξονίδῃ* (*ἀμαξ-* later *S*: *ἀμαξονίδῃ q*); III. 259 *φεραῖ* (i.e. a choice between *-αῖη* and *-αῖς*) *S*, *φεραῖας* *Q* (*φεράας q*); V. 50 *φορβέων* (*-αῖων q*); V. 141 *ἐλάσσεις* (*-αῖς* corrected from *-εις q*). At IV. 89 *Q* has *βιάζεθαι* (*sic*, whence *q*'s *βίαζε*); *S* *βιάζω*, with *ο* very clearly by correction and a gap (before *μαντεύεσθαι*) in which *αι* is faintly visible (? also a cross-stroke as in *Q*).³ At IV. 300 *S* has *περίτεμψίτε*, corrected to *-ταμ-* in such a way that the top of *ε* is still visible; *Q* has the same result, but the top stroke of his *ε* is finer and in lighter ink than the rest, and he seems to have started with *-τάμ-*, and then joined the tops of *α* and *μ* (in text ink) and completed *ε* with the wish to reproduce Lascaris' writing faithfully (*περίτεμψίτε q*). At V. 65 *S* has *ἐπεβάσατο* (*sic*, for *ἐπεβάσατο*), *Q* *ἐπεροῦάτο* (*ἐπεροάσατο q*). At VI. 10 *S* first had *δυθβάς*,⁴ and then corrected *β* to *μ*, and in the margin set another *μ* and *δυσμάς*;⁵ *Q* has *δυθβάς*^{μας} and marginal *μ* (*δυθμάς q*).

A valuable variant comes to light at V. 17. There *S* has *ἀεὶ καλὸν ἔνδυμα τὸ τήνας*, with *ἔμμμα* in the margin (*ἔμμμα* from one later hand, *iota subscr.* probably from another); *Q* *ἀεὶ καλὸν ἔνδυμα τὸ τήνας* (dots and suprascript in text hand, but in lighter ink and finer pen); *q* is as *Q*, but all in the text ink and without dots. We shall see that Callimachus in *q* is a copy of *Q*; and *Q*'s additions in this ink and pen are independent of *S*, to which *ἔμμμα*

¹ *μακηδότικοι ρα νέσθαι* II.; *cett.* divide correctly.

² Perhaps we should add his *ιδε* (*ιδε S cett.*, VI. 98). His *ἀπολοῖς* (so *q*: *ἀπλοῖς S cett.*, III. 230) is a more doubtful case.

³ If so, this stroke is probably Valla's work. *βιάζεθαι* was due to the influence of *μαντεύεσθαι* (just following).

⁴ Lascaris or his source several times confounds *β*, *κ*, and *μ*. At VI. 97 *ταυαῦτ*, corrected

to *τοῖα*, may have been a gloss in the source; and at VI. 101 *ὑπ' ἀπ' ἀπόλλωνος* looks like an

ancestral doublet *ὑπ' ἀπ' ἀπόλλωνος*.

⁵ *δυσμάς* occurs here only in *S* and (in the text) in *GIBr* (*δημὰ H*). In *S* it perhaps comes from a later hand; certainly we have nowhere else any proof of interaction between the *s* manuscripts, on the one side, and *cett.* on the other.

must have
(omitted
read here.
LXX.; IV
than ἔμμμα
had been
need. Th
first, a lig
and ligatu
correction
out the m
ἔνδυμα τὸ
S's text;
ousted ἔνδ

The A
pen. Bes
(c) and (h
(I) S
Politian);

όσσα (Po
except Q
ed. pr.: φ
128 and r
-ο of δύν
good the
in lacuna
sprawling
VI. 86, a
to ἐδιδάσ
between
all these
difference
suppleme
other sou
own text

(2) S
cett.); IV
(-ous AB
probably

1 — mar
Why ἡν sho
text is quite

must have accrued from the common stock of *cett.*, ἀεὶ καλὸν ὄμμα τὸ τήνας (omitted by *ABCK*). I am convinced that ἀεὶ καλὸν ἔνδυμα τήνας is to be read here. The rare ἔνδυμα (cited by L. and S. only from Plutarch, *Solon*, 8; *LXX.*; *N.T.*) can hardly be a scribe's conjecture here; and it is more apposite than ὄμμα, for a mirror could not have aided Athene to improve her eye, if it had been unsightly, whereas it *could* have helped her to rearrange her dress at need. The corruption may have happened thus, in an earlier manuscript—first, a ligatured *εν* was misread as *ω* (to which, as in *S* and *Q*, it approximated), and ligatured *δυ*, badly written, became *μ* through corruption or conscious correction; then the scribe, after writing the resultant ὠμμα, added τὸ to piece out the metre. Transferred as a variant to another MS., this resulted in ὠμμα τὸ ἔνδυμα τήνας. Then (a) an ancestor of *S* incorporated τὸ in the line, whence *S*'s text; (b) in the other line of descent, ὠμμα became ὄμμα, and with τὸ ousted ἔνδυμα, but ὠμμα survived in the source of *Q*'s additions.

The Additions to S.—Several of these are undoubtedly from Lascaris' own pen. Besides the scholia and marginal reminders already described [groups (c) and (h), and the next paragraph, on pp. 61-2 above], they consist of:

(1) Supplements of lacunae: viz. V. 47 ὦ δῶλαι (ὦ δῶλαι Π, *ωδωλαι* Politian); 48 ἐς (*cett.*); 78 *ad fin.* θέμιδες (Π Politian *ed. pr.*); 108 *ad init.* ὄσσα (Politian); 124 the suprascript in καὶ ποιῶν (ποιῶν Politian, *ed. pr.*, *cett.* except *Qq*); 131 ὥς φαμένα (ὥς *BEE*, ὥς or ὡς *cett.*; φαμένα *EeΠF* Politian *ed. pr.*: φαμένη 2²: the word omitted *x*); 136 θυγάτηρ (Π Politian *ed. pr.*); 128 and 139, to be discussed later; VI. 10 σε ἐς (*S solus*, for πόδες, accenting -ο of δύναντο); 13 ἦνθες in margin (*S solus*, seemingly in the hope of making good the defect in his text's τρις μὲν δὴ ἀχελώιον ἀργυροδίνην); 20 αὐτή in lacuna (*S solus*, for ἐν βόας). All these have been added neatly; in blotched sprawling letters he has placed ἔβοσκεν (*solus*) after ποιμνί' at the end of VI. 86, and χαίρετε (*solus*) before παρθενικαὶ in VI. 118, and ligatured το to ἐδιδάσκε in VI. 21, where a space of four or five letters had intervened between ἐδιδάσκε and τέχνην (ἐδιδ alone, *x*: ἐδιδάσκετο *cett.* except *Qq*). In all these passages Valla, doubtless inferring conjecture from the obvious difference in script between the addition and the context, either omitted the supplement from the text of *Q*, in some cases filling the vacancy later from other sources, or (as seemingly in V. 128, 131, 136, 139) set *S*'s words in his own text with a special pen and ink.

(2) Suprascript changes: viz. III. 10 εὐκαπῆς^μ (εὐκαπῆς *Qq*: εὐκαμῆς *cett.*); IV. 305 ὦλην^{σῆν} (ὦλην *cett.*, *I* by correction from [?] ἀχύν^{ον}); V. 5 μεγάλως^{ον} (-ους *ABCKz*²); 107 ὄσσα over πάσσα (Π Politian); 135 ὄνκ^σ (Politian); and probably V. 20 ἐκλεψάν^ε (ἐκλεψαν *Qq*: ἐβλεψεν *E* Politian *ed. pr.*: ἐβλεψαν

¹ — marks the word as a personal name. Why *π* should be repeated is not clear, for the text is quite legible. The topmost mark seems

to be c (s), and the margin has ὦλη in Lascaris' hand.

cell.), and VI. 7 ἐσκέφατο¹ (*solus*, ἐσκέφατε to be taken as a parenthesis). Q lacks all these features except V. 135, though all were, I believe, in the manuscript when he made his copy.¹ The additions at V. 20, 107, VI. 7 he would reject as not in the script, those at III. 10 and IV. 305 as not in the ink, of the context, whereas φ̄ (V. 135) was nearly enough contextual to deceive him; and at V. 5 his rejection may have been due to deliberate preference for the original reading of S.²

(3) Marginal additions:³ viz. I. 75 διός (*solus*; text τίδος); V. 75 αἶμαι (to elucidate the text's αμαι, corrected from αμα, and with accent and breathing erased); 135 διός (text ἀλλὰ καὶ sic: ἀλλὰ καὶ^{διός} Q, with suprascript in lighter ink: ἀλλ' αὐτῇ z, ἀλλὰ διός *cell.* Politian *ed. pr.*), and possibly V. 17 ὄμμα (for ἐνδυμα: SQ and q discussed above, pp. 64-5: ὄμμα *cell.* Politian *ed. pr.*), 24 παρ' (sic, for περ: παρ' E Politian *ed. pr.*: περ *cell.*), 69 εὔσαν (sic, as in *ed. pr.*: text ἔσσαν, with ABCKQqEeΠ: εὔσαν Politian, ἐδσαν *ed. pr.*: οὔσαν z). Opposite the title of *Hymn V.* S has ἡρωελεγείοι (*solus*) in Lascaris' hand. Of these changes Q has only διός (V. 135); and that is in an ink which points to his disregard of S's margin and to his indebtedness to Ee's kinsman (see below, p. 69).

Whence did Lascaris get his additions? His scholia are probably an inheritance from his source, though *via*, the roughly written marginal gloss at I. 33, should, I think, be regarded as his own. To his own conjecture may be ascribed the additions at I. 75, IV. 305, VI. 7, 10, 13, 20, 86, and 118, none of which is found in any extant manuscript, or in Politian or the *editio princeps*; the completion of ἐδιδάσκετο (VI. 24); and perhaps the corrections at III. 10 and V. 75. Probably his own, too, is the marginal ἡρωελεγείοι opposite the title of *Hymn V.* For most of the other additions in that *Hymn* (viz. those at 17, 20, 24, 47, 48, 69, 78, 107, 108, 124, 128,⁴ 131, 135 twice, 136, 139) the sole consistent thread of support that we can find is in Politian's text, of which the first edition was published in 1489. It is more probable that Lascaris borrowed from Politian⁵ than Politian from Lascaris in these passages. Lascaris (1434-1501)⁶ left Milan, where S (1464) had been written, in 1465; and, after a year at the Neapolitan court, he settled in Messina for the remaining thirty-five years of his life (1466-1501). We have evidence of his scholarly activity after Politian's work came out, in two manuscripts dated

¹ The additions to S from Politian (see below) must stand or fall together; and, since Valla received part or all of the text of four of them from S (pp. 70-72 below), we may fairly assume that all were in S before Q was copied. The added ε of S in VI. 7 is the same semi-supine letter as in the Lascarean φαμένα (V. 131); and ους at V. 5, in almost or actually contextual ink, is clearly Lascaris'.

² More probably he believed the ink to be non-contextual; for in six passages (see p. 64 above) he accepts doublets that are undoubtedly contextual in S.

³ For δυσμᾶς (VI. 10) see above, p. 64, n. 5.

⁴ Here δὲ (II Politian Hq) probably underlies the blotched κ̄ in S (see p. 71 below). καὶ is also found in FIBr and *ed. pr.*; but S shows elsewhere no trace of indebtedness to any manuscript of the z group, if we put out of reckoning δυσμᾶς (VI. 10).

⁵ But εὔσαν (V. 69) coincides with *ed. pr.* in the position of the breathing. Politian's text lacks breathings.

⁶ For the details of C. Lascaris' life see E. Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellénique* (Paris, 1885), I. pp. LXXI. sqq.; J. E. Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, II. pp. 76-8.

respect
Bembo
S seem
similar
traces o
latter's
above-r
of thos
δὲ βιότ
similar
agrees
at 20, 2
kinsman
V. 5 I t
found h
ancesto

To
ἐκ
κάθεν
perhaps
was eas
αὶ
μεναλίη
(Hand
suprasc
cell.).

ἀρπαγί
χαίρε δὲ
may be
is found

Of
is not f
breathin
than fo

III. 12
257 εἰμ
deleted
latter w
and V.

respectively 1490 and 1500, and in his teaching Greek to the future Cardinal Bembo in 1492; and indeed he was only fifty-five years old in 1489. True, S seems to have been sent by him to be copied by Valla, and may have been similarly lent, at an earlier date, to Politian too; but I have found no other traces of communication between Lascaris and Politian, and, if he lacked the latter's aid, Lascaris must either have used a variety of manuscripts for the above-named passages of *Hymn* V., or have himself attained some or all of those sixteen readings by conjecture. But (1) S shows no other traces of contamination; (2) the successful restoration by conjecture of *δωσῶ* δὲ βιότου *τέρμα*, *θυγάτηρ*, and *ὀλολυγαῖς* is incredible, and the supplying similarly of *ῥμμα*, *θέμιδες* (*sic*), and *ποιών* highly improbable; and (3), as II agrees with Politian in eleven of the sixteen readings (the exceptions are at 20, 24, 69, 108, and ϕ in 135), Politian probably found those eleven in II's kinsman D, which he used extensively if not exclusively, and not in S. At V. 5 I take S's *μεγάλως* (all in the ink and script of the text) to have been found by Lascaris in his source, and to have existed earlier in the common ancestor of S and ABCK¹ (-*ους* ABCKz²: -*ως* *cett.*).

To S Lascaris certainly contributed the suprascripts in *ἰχώ* (III. 245) and *κάδεν* (V. 140) and the marginal *ἀρεσιδα* at V. 130; and at IV. 173 it was perhaps he who put dots under *ἄρην* and set *ἄρηα* (so z² *ed. pr.*; but conjecture was easy) in the margin. He may also be responsible for the corrections in *μεναλίη* (III. 224) and *αὐτὸς* (III. 256). Probably it was a later scribe (Hand I.) who emended III. 184, where we find *ἔξοχον*, but with *ν* of the suprascript half-deleted, doubtless with intent to produce *ἔξοχα* of *ed. pr.* (-*ον* *cett.*). Hand II. gives the suprascripts in *πτοηθεῖς* (III. 191), *θεῆς* (IV. 231), *ἀρπαγίμας* (VI. 9). Another hand (III.) may have written the suprascript in *χαῖρε δὲ κέρατος* (III. 44) and the marginal *ἔννα* at VI. 30 (text *ἔναι*); but both may be Lascarean. None of these changes (of Lascaris or Hands I., II., III.) is found in Q.

Of doubtful ascription are over eighty other alterations, whose resultant is not found in Q. These comprise eighteen changes of accent, thirteen of breathing, and one of word-division, nine cases of added *iota subscr.*, and more than forty changes in words. Notable among these last are II. 94 *τόσσα*:

III. 125 *φιν*, 162 *λυθείσαις*, 198 *δίκτυναν*, 213 *ἀσύλλωτοι*: IV. 136 *ἀψίδα*, 257 *εἶπας*: V. 16 and 26 *χρίματα*: VI. 9 *μετέστιχεν*, 9 *κώρας*, 108 *ταρον* (*ἐν* deleted later); V. 25 *βαλοῖσα* changed to *λαβοῖσα* (*λαβ*- Politian and II, the latter with *γρ' βαλοῖσα* in margin: *βαλ*- Q *Ec Fed. pr.*: *λαβοῦσα* Ac: *λαβῶσα* z²); and V. 108 *ἦεν* (? -*εν*) written high, after *εὐχόμενοι*. At IV. 64 the superfluous

¹ Their close kinship will appear when the lacunae of ABCK are treated.

δὲ after ἐφύλασσε has been underlined (z^2 and *ed. pr.* omit it); and at V. 27 a metrical defect is indicated by the mark in κῶραι.

Q's Additions.—We have already noticed some scholia, and other additional items, which *Q* received from *S*.¹ An account must now be given of *Q*'s other changes and additions, which are all in Valla's hand and are written in lighter inks than the text. They fall into three classes, according to the pen and the ink used in each case:

(1) Those written with the thicker pen that is used for the text, but in a slightly lighter ink—

IV. 322, the suprascript in ῥησσόμενοι^{ov} (-οι *Sq*: -ον *ABCK* *ed. pr.* *EeF*: λισσόμενον z^2).

V. 47 αἱ δῶλαι in lacuna (so *ABCK ed. pr.*: αἱ δῶλαι *Ee*: ὧ δῶλαι *Π*, ὠδῶλαι *Politian*, ὦ δῶλαι *S* by Lascaris' addition: αἱ δοῦλαι *F*, αἱ δοῦναι *HI*, οἱ δοῦναι *Δ*).

48 ἐς—(*sic*) in lacuna (ἐς *S* by Lascaris' addition;² *Politian*; *cett.* in text hands).

VI. 18 ἔα (after πτολίεσιν) *ad fin.* (so *ABCK*: *S* ends with πτολίεσιν, *Π* with ἐ, *ed. pr.* with ἐαδό: *Ee* give ἐαδότα τέθμα δῶκε [δῶκε *e*], z ἐανδότα τέθμα δῶκε).

20 ἐν κόας in lacuna after καὶ (*S* the same lacuna, filled by Lascaris with αὔτη: *Π* a lacuna for καὶ ἐν βόας, which words *cett.* give faultlessly).

22 (after τις) only ὑπερ (*S* stops at τις, *ABCK* at ὑπερβα, *Π ed. pr.* at ὑπερβασίας: q^3 *Eex* give ὑπερβασίας ἀλέγται).

23 π initially, the rest of the line blank (so *ABCK*: a gap of one line *Sq⁴eFH*, of two lines *E*: only final ἰδέσθαι *Π ed. pr.* and by addition *I*).

For these passages I believe that *Q* drew on some manuscript of the *ABCK* stock. For *ABCK*, which have *Q*'s supplements at IV. 322 and V. 47, are alone in giving π at VI. 23; and at VI. 22 Valla would surely have written ὑπερβασίας or ὑπερβασίας ἀλέγται, had his source given either reading, whereas his ὑπερ shows an intelligible cautiousness if we assume that he was faced with ὑπερβα. At VI. 20 our choice of a source for him is narrowed, to rest between *C* and *K*; for these two manuscripts alone give, in βόας, the form of β which caused Valla to write κόας.⁵

To this class, too, belong three⁶ other passages, of which V. 128 and 131 will be discussed later. In the third, V. 108, we find an initial lacuna in

¹ Groups (*c*) and (*h*) on pp. 61-2 above.

² *Q*'s rejection of *S*'s ἐς, which it is probable that Lascaris had previously added there from *Politian*, follows his general rule of disregarding the non-contextual elements of *S*.

³ See below, p. 75.

⁴ *q* seems to have thought the solitary letter not worth recording; cf. his attitude at V. 136 and 139 (below, p. 75).

⁵ Also, at V. 18 the dark dot in ἐρι produces the reading (ἐρι) of *ABCK* alone.

⁶ It is not quite clear from the photograph

whether the suprascript in *Q*'s δστις (VI. 116), written with the text-pen, is also in the text-ink or in this lighter shade; but the former seems more probable. *q* disregards the correction;

H has δτι, *I* δττοι, *E* δς τμ, *cett.* δς τοι or δς τοι. *Q*'s correction is not necessarily drawn from *E*, as the original slip would have been easy to make in copying from *S*, and may have been corrected at once from *S*, or later from *C* or *K*.

ABCK have πο
πάσσα,
may be

(2)

lighter i
the follo

give no

ἄχθομέν

Q has κ

προκαλῇ

(κούρα τ

ABCK,

ΔIBr pe

At I

whether

the line

πρόκας j

Valla has

ἀλλὰ κῆ

Q disrega

at I. 28),

which pr

class.

I be

akin to *E*

E alone

B ed. pr.

dot in th

excluded

-ον *SE P*

γρ' ὑπαξ

e agrees v

have τεύ

VI. 77 (ῥ)

the line v

¹ See below

² Similarly

ABCK and in S, where it is filled later by Lascaris with Politian's *δοσα*: *Ee* have *πολλά*, *Π ed. pr.* and *z πόσσα*. *Q* has filled his original lacuna with *πάσσα*, which, as it lacks support from the other extant manuscripts, I fancy may be Valla's own supplement, intended to repeat *πάσσα* of 107.

(2) Those written with a somewhat finer pen than the text, and in a still lighter ink than class (1). If we seek for a common source for all this class, the following, whose resultants belong to all *cett.*, except *S* (and sometimes *q*), give no clue: I. 63 *νερίλ^Ηος*: II. 89 *ἄξιλι^Ηφν*: III. 190 *βριτόμαρτι^Ηρ*: IV. 183 *ἄχθομένος* (? *αἰθομένος G*), 282 *θινόγ^Ηδ*: VI. 30 *ἔναι*. Similarly, at VI. 77 *Q* has *καλυξὼ* (*καλυξῶ S*, *παλυξὼ q¹*), *cett.* *πολυξὼ*. *z²* is excluded by III. 99 *προκαλῆς* (so *q*: *προβολῆς* or *-ῆς z²*: *προμολῆς cett.*) and IV. 102 *κοῦρα τε* (*κούρα τε z²*: *βοῦρα τε qE*, *βοῦρά τε Π*, *βοῦρά τε cett.*), and perhaps, as are *ABCK*, by IV. 130 *διψαλέον* (*-ον ABCK*, *-ην Π ed. pr. EeF*: *δαψιλέην z²*); *ΔIBr* perhaps by III. 238 *παρράρη^Αη* (*παραλή ΔIBr*: *παρραλή cett.*).²

At III. 155 *Q* has *πρόκεσ^{ασ} ἡδὲ λαγωοῖ^{ουσ}* (*πρόκες ἡδὲ λαγωοῖ Sq cett.*); whether this futile correction is merely due to the accusatives in this phrase in the line before, or to *S*'s gloss *νεβροῦς* (over *πρόκες*: it obviously belongs to *πρόκας* just above), which *Q* does not reproduce, is uncertain. At V. 135 Valla has *ἀλλὰ καὶ^{διδε}*, with dots and suprascript belonging to this class; *S* has *ἀλλὰ καὶ* in the text, and a marginal *διός* which Lascaris also wrote. As *Q* disregards all *S*'s other *marginalia* (except the contextually-written variant at I. 28), it would seem that here too he does the same, taking *διδε*, the reading which prevails outside *z*, from the same source as his other changes of this class.

I believe the common source to have been some manuscript, not extant, akin to *E* and *e*, neither of which pair fulfils all the requirements of the case. *E* alone agrees with *Q*'s corrected text at V. 27 (*κόραι¹ Q*, *κόραις E*: *κούραι B ed. pr.*: *κόραι e cett.* Politian), and at IV. 8 it shares *ἔχθουσι* (*-ιν Q*, with the dot in this ink) only with *q*, the already excluded *ABCK*, and perhaps *G*, also excluded (*-ιν cett.*); but it is on the wrong side at V. 14 (*ὑπαξόνιον Q*: *-ον SE Politian*: *-ω Π*, *-ων ABCKz ed. pr.* and *e*, which last has the suprascript *γρ' ὑπαξόνιον*), as is *e* at III. 127 (*κληταὶ Q*: *κληταὶ Se*: *βληταὶ E cett.*). *e* agrees with *QqΠ* at V. 120 in reading *τεῦ* and *μενεῦσι* (*μενεῦντι Π*), while *cett.* have *τεῦ* and *μενεῦντι* without glosses. Both *E* and *e* have *Q*'s resultants at VI. 77 (*ἦλθε Q*: *ἦλθε BCSF*: *ἦνθε AKqΠEeHI*), and at VI. 15 they alone end the line with *καλλίχορον*, which *Q* adds with this pen and ink to *τρίς δ' ἐπὶ* of

¹ See below, p. 74, n. 2.

² Similarly unavailing to guide us here is

Q's link at III. 254 *ἰνα χιώνης* (*ἰνα χιώνης S*: *ἰναχιώνης qz*: *ἰναχιώνης cett.*, *ed. pr.*).

S; but at V. 17, where Q has ὄμμα (*solus*, above ἐνδύμα), they give ὄμμα with II, Politian, *ed. pr.* and z (*ABCK* omit; for *SQq* see pp. 64-5 above).

The study of the scholia supports this verdict. Of such extant manuscripts as are not copies of printed texts, *BCGHAIBr* entirely lack scholia, and *AKS* have each only a handful of brief glosses; thus only *QqIIeEF* possess any considerable bulk of marginal and interlinear annotations. In these last six the scholia differ markedly in details from those presented by J. Lascaris and Froben in their editions. *q* owes his set to *Q*; and II and *F* have less extensive equipment than *E* and *e*, while of this pair *e* is the better supplied. A collation of the scholia of all six, though I have only found time to pursue it minutely through *Hymns* I. and II., shows that *QqEe* possess scholia some of which are entirely lacking from *IIF* and *ed. pr.*, while others are notably different from those of these last three in many details of readings.

(3) Those written in the ink of class (1), but with a very fine pen; viz. part of V. 128 and of V. 131; *θυγάτηρ* at V. 136; and ΓΜσ (*sic*) at V. 139. All four passages require detailed discussion. But, first, it should be premised that, in copying *Q* from *S*, Valla appears to have made it his general principle to reject all such elements in *S* as seemed to him not to belong to Lascaris' original text; and this rejection involved, with exceptions which I shall state shortly, all *S*'s *marginalia*, interlinear glosses, suprascript corrections, and supplements of lacunae. The exceptions are the marginal *πέλη* at I. 28 (a variant on the text's *ῥήρη*, and obviously written like and along with the text itself); the glosses noted in groups (c) and (h) above (pp. 61-2), in which Valla doubtless recognized Lascaris' writing; the suprascript *φ* at V. 135, which he wrongly regarded as contextual in script; and the supplements of lacunae in the four passages now under consideration. Towards filling the lacunae left by this rigour of rejection, and the others which he found in *S*, he got what aid he could from *C* (or *K*); and he used this manuscript once, and (later) one of the *Ee* stock several times, to correct the text he had received from Lascaris. But before¹ he had recourse to *E*'s and *e*'s kinsman, he dealt with the lacunae which Lascaris' original text had left at V. 128, 131, 136, and 139. *C* (or *K*) gave him *ὧς* at V. 131; but it was of no help at 128 and 136, and at 139 it was even a trifle more defective than *S*'s first draft (*σύν τ' ad fin. S: σύν C, σὺν K*). Therefore he grudgingly fell back on *S*'s additions in all four passages, marking, as it seems, his suspicion of them by using this finer script. Let us now consider them in detail.

¹ I infer this from two considerations—(a) that the ink used in these four passages is that employed for the *C* (or *K*) additions; (b) that, if the manuscript akin to *E* and *e* had been consulted before the readings in the four passages were settled, it would, while unavailing at V. 128 and the end of 136, have given Valla the whole of *ἐλελυγαις* at 139, and *ὧς φάμενα* (131) would have appeared in *Q* in the lighter ink used for

class (2). However, the *Ee* additions may have preceded both classes (1) and (3); for we find them strictly limited to corrections of words already present in *Q*'s original text, though (e.g.) Valla could probably have completed VI. 22 from this source (*Ee* have it in full), and *Ee*'s *ψεν* (V. 136 *ad init.*), if their kinsman had it, might as readily have been used by Valla as *CK*'s *π* (VI. 23 *ad init.*).

At V
readings
δωσὼ κα
(Βοιωτῶν
δωσὼ κ) ^{δὲ}
καὶ βιότο
context,
hand. δ
the accen
in the tex
some man
are under
identical
τ (ligatur
to this let
less frequ
forms of
writes δω
but δὲ an
same as i
This diff
puzzling;
the secon
conjectur
seeming t
fail here;
abandone
else do w
enough to
At V
leaving a
φάμενα w
(or ὧς) φα
s, φ, and
forward sl
sometimes
of a consi
in thickne
determine
(not ὧς or
(or K), rei
(sic Q) fro
Valla may

At V. 128 the text is complex in both S and Q. First let us note the readings of the other manuscripts: πολυχρόνιον (alone) *ad fin.* ABCKEe: δωσῶ καὶ βίотου τέρμα πολυχρόνιον FIBr with *ed. pr.*: δωσῶ δὲ βίотου (βοιωτοῦ Π) τέρμα πολυχρόνιον qPIH with Politian. Now for S and Q. S has δωσῶ κ̃ βίотου τέρμα—(sic) πολυχρόνιον, and κ̃ again in the margin: Q δωσῶ^ε καὶ βίотου τέρμα πολυχρόνιον. In S only πολυχρόνιον is written as large as the context, and in the same script; but the other words, too, are in Lascaris' hand. δωσῶ has δω ligatured, and similarly σω (in each case as in 127), and the accent is continuous with ω in true Lascarean fashion; δ is not matched in the text, being a triangle with a curl on the apex, but this form occurs in some *marginalia* (e.g. δικταῖον ὄρος, III. 199) by the side of other letters that are undeniably Lascarean. κ̃ of the text is blotched, but the marginal κ̃ is identical with that found in the text of l. 68. In both βίотου and τέρμα, τ (ligatured) has the shape, not of Lascaris' detached τ, but that given by him to this letter in ligatures elsewhere; the form Ϸ he also uses elsewhere, though less frequently than β; and ep here, while the second least frequent of his four forms of ligatured ep, is used by him in thirty-six other places. In Q Valla writes δωσῶ καὶ with the pen and ink employed for class (1) of his additions, but δὲ and βίотου τέρμα in the very fine script of class (3), whose ink is the same as in class (1); while his πολυχρόνιον is of the quality of the context. This difference between his treatment of δωσῶ καὶ and of βίотου τέρμα is puzzling; perhaps he recognized Lascaris' hand in the first pair, but regarded the second as non-Lascarean. His δέ, too, is difficult; but he may have conjectured it, preferring it to καὶ, despite its metrical weakness here, as seeming to make a better link with the preceding line. His two usual sources fail here; and, of the manuscripts that give δέ, q is a copy of Q, H probably abandoned z's καὶ (FIBr) for δὲ on the ground just ascribed to Q, and nowhere else do we find Valla using Π (whose βοιωτοῦ it would have been difficult enough to emend aright) or Politian.

At V. 131 S gives ὥς φαμένα, Q ὡς φάμενα (sic). ABCK omit φαμένα, leaving a blank, and AC give ὡς, B ὡς, K ὡς: Ee have ὡς φαμένα: Π has φαμένα with ὡς, Politian with ως, *ed. pr.* with Ως, qF with ὡς: z³ have ὡς (or ὥς) φαμένη. In S the writing is undoubtedly Lascarean, as the shapes of ς, φ, and μ show. While the two words are clearly an addition, lacking the forward slant of the text, ω and φ are of the size of the context, in which ς is sometimes as small as it is here. Q has ὡς and φ as class (1); his άμενα are of a consistency nearer the fine script of class (3), but they differ only slightly in thickness from class (1) and the context. Thus his source is difficult to determine. The ink of Q excludes Ee's kinsman, and anyhow Ee have ὡς (not ὥς or ὥς) with φαμένα. Ink and script suggest a blending of ὡς from C (or K), reinforcing the speciously almost-contextual lettering of S, with φάμενα (sic Q) from S, the thick φ for a thin one being due to inadvertence. Or Valla may have found Lascaris' ὡς φ nearly enough contextual to deceive

him, adding *άμενα* from his *αμένα* in the guise he deems appropriate when he adopts non-contextual elements of S.

At V. 136 both S and Q have *θυγάτηρ* at the end of an otherwise blank line. So II, Politian, *ed. pr.*: *ψεύδεα ad init.* and *ά θυγάτηρ ad fin.* F, *ψεύδεα* and *αι θυγάτηρ 2²*: *ψευ ad init.*, the rest blank *Ee*: a blank line *ABCKq*. In S the writing is undeniably Lascaris'. *θ, υ, α, η, ρ* are matched in the context, and *γ* is met there, though *ι* is his prevailing form; all the letters but *ρ* are ligatured together, and *τ* has his ligature-form. But the whole word is written smaller than the context, whose slant it also lacks; hence Valla presents it in very fine lettering.

At V. 139 S has *σύν τ' ὀλολγαῖς* (*sic*), Q *σύν τ' +* a space of five letters + *ΓΜσ* (*sic*). *ABC* end the line with *σύν*, K with *σὺν*: *e* has *σύν τ' ὀλολυνγῆς*, *cett.* and *ed. pr.* *σύν τ' ὀλολυνγαῖς*, Politian *συντολολυνγαις*. In S *σύν τ'* is written like the context; and *ὀλολγαῖς*, too, is Lascarean. Again, as in *θυγάτηρ* of 136, we find *γ* (not *ι*); *λ* with a curl on top (twice) and the strokes separated (once) is matched rather in Lascaris' *marginalia* than in the body of his text; *υ* is clearly his, as are *αι* (in ligature) and *ς*. The key to Q's economy of borrowing here lies, I believe, in the way S's word is made up. *ολολ* and *ς* are all detached letters; so was *υ* at first, but later it was linked to the ligatured *γαι*, the process thickening the down-stroke of *γ* and lengthening its stem. Q seems to have rejected the scattered *ὀλολν* as non-contextual, but accepted the ligatured *γαι* and *ς*, in which group *ι* and *ς* are of full context-size; hence his *ΓΜσ*, in which the dubious intermediate lettering may be intended to reproduce the ligatured *αι*, though he has given the cross-stroke to the wrong element (M for M).

Relations between Lascaris and Valla.—The internal evidence, adduced above to show that Q is a copy of S, is reinforced by what is known of the relations that existed between C. Lascaris and G. Valla. The former taught Greek at Milan from 1460 to 1465;¹ and there Valla's period of pupilage under him must have begun at latest in mid-1462, and probably continued till 1465.² The maintenance of friendly relations between them, after both had left Milan, is proved by (a) two letters from Lascaris to Valla;³ (b) a manuscript copy of Lascaris' *Greek Grammar*, owned and annotated by Valla, and still extant (*Mutinensis* III. A. 12), and Books II. and III. of the same work, written in Valla's hand (*Mut.* III. B. 5).⁴ Of Lascaris' letters to Valla, one was written from Messana on June 15, 1494, while the other is undated; and on July 19, 1492, Valla, writing to Jacopo Antiquari, mentions a recent letter from Lascaris.⁵

¹ J. E. Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, II, p. 77; J. L. Heiberg, *Beiträge zur Geschichte Georg Valla's und seiner Bibliothek* (Beiheft zum Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, XVI. Leipzig, 1896), p. 7.

² Heiberg, *op. cit.* p. 7.

³ Heiberg, *op. cit.* p. 61, *Ep.* 3; p. 88, Appendix, No. 1.

⁴ Heiberg, *op. cit.* p. 7. Further, I think that some Greek MSS., owned by Valla and now in the Biblioteca Nazionale at Madrid (e.g. No. 113), must have been in Lascaris' possession at his death and accompanied his own collection to Naples and ultimately to Madrid.

⁵ Heiberg, *op. cit.*, p. 88, *Ep.* 36.

The
and 1492
ments w
Hymn V.
Mirandu
certain m

q is
the contr

(1) (C)
which are
may be c

(2) No

I. 76

IV. 89

V. 13

113-4

141

¹ Cited by H
identifies the E
² See Schnei
³ Seemingly
in S.

The Date of Q.—Valla must have written *Q* at some time between 1489 and 1492. The earlier limit is provided by his incorporation of the supplements which, as we have seen, Lascaris took from Politian's edition of *Hymn V.*, first published in 1489. The later we owe to a letter from Pico di Mirandula to Valla, written on May 8, 1492, in which he asks for the loan of certain manuscripts, among them the *Hymns* of Callimachus.¹

q is a Copy of *Q*.—H. Keil wrongly declared² that *q* agrees with *F*. On the contrary, it is a copy of *Q*, as may be seen from the subjoined evidence:

(1) *Q* and *q* share forty-one major and thirty-nine minor peculiarities, which are found in no other manuscript, and from among which the following may be cited:

	<i>Qq.</i>	<i>cett.</i>
I. 41	γυνῶνι	γυνῶνοι : γυνῶνοι
II. 52	ἀγάλακτος	ἀγάλακτες
61	φορέεσκε ὅ δ'	φορέεσκειν ὅ δ' (ὁ δ')
III. 113	αἰείνειν	αἰείρειν
161	συνήνθετο	συνήντετο : συνήντεθο
190	ἥ ποτε	ἥς ποτε
197	τὰ σφ' σαώσαν	τά σφ' ἐσάωσαν
IV. 39	ἐπεμίγγετο	ἐπεμίσγετο
72	παρακέκληται	παρακέκλιται
139	ὠρχήσαντο	ὠρχήσατο : ὠρχήσατο
164	εἰνύτις	εἰνύτις
259	ἐπείχολον	ἐπεὶ χόλον
V. 32	πέξητε ³	πέξηται : πήξηται
VI. 32	τουτάκης	τουτάκις
47	ἐλίνυσον ἐλίνυσον	ἐλίνυσον : ἐλίνυsson
III	χεῖτο	κεῖτο : κείντο

(2) Notable indications of borrowing by *q* from *Q*:

	<i>Q.</i>	<i>q.</i>
I. 76	ἡφαίστοιω (with <i>ηφ</i> ligatured)	ἡφαίστοιω
IV. 89	βιάζεθαι (sic) μαντεύεσθαι	βίαζε μαντεύεσθαι
V. 13	ὦ ἴτ'	ὦ ἴτ' (from <i>τ</i> , resembling <i>τ</i> , in <i>Q</i>).
113-4	ὅπότεν οὐκ ^π δαίμονος ^π δαίμονος	ὅπότεν οὐκ ^π δαίμονος ^π δαίμονος
141	ἐλάσσεισ	ἐλάσσαις by correction from -εις

¹ Cited by Heiberg (*op. cit.* p. 61, *Ep.* 2), who identifies the *Hymns* with *Mut.* III. E. 11 (*Q*).

² See Schneider, *Præf.* XXXI.

³ Seemingly a conjecture by *Q*, as -αι is clear in *S*.

⁴ Such subscription of an omitted letter (ὀπότεν οὐκ *cett.* rightly here) is found in *S* also at IV. 8 (8ης), 319 (8ης), V. 83 (ἐκόλασαν).

- VI. 21 ^Q ἐδιδάσκει (sic) + space of two letters + τέχνην ^q ἐδίδασκε τέχνην
- 51 ^Q τμαρίοισιν ^q ιμαρίοισιν (from Q's τ with only half cross-stroke).
- 73 ^Q γονέεσ (with second ε supine)¹ ^q γονέης

The fidelity of *q*'s scribe to his exemplar is attested by his self-corrections

at II. 16, ἡγησάμην (ἡγασάμην Q); IV. 166, γένον (Q) from γένος; V. 138, κῶρε (Q) from the necessary κῶραι; VI. 69 ἄφυσσον (Q) from ἄφυσσον.

(3) Evidence from corrections and variants:

In several places, where *q* presents an undisturbed text, *Q* shows either corrections or variant readings. Some of the corrections (there are thirty such) are not in themselves evidence either for or against my contention that *q* was copied from *Q*; e.g. in I. 63, where *Q* has νενί^hλος (with *h* in lighter ink), *q* cett. νενίηλος, no conclusion can be drawn.² But in IV. 102, *Q*'s κοῦρα τε cannot have come from *q*'s βοῦρα τε, since *q* writes β as it is printed.³ However, *q* is clearly indebted to *Q* in the following instances:

- I. 44 ἀπ' ὀμφαλῶσ SQ: ἀπ' ὀμφαλοῦ *q* (-ὸς cett.).
Here -οῦ is due to the influence of ἀπ'.
- II. 16 ἀεργοῖσθ (i.e. -ὸν altered to -οῖσθ) Q: *q* started with ἀεργοῦ (*Q*'s ν resembles ν), but changed ν and its accent to σθ (-ὸς S cett.).
- 31 αἰδεῖ SQ: αἰδεῖοι *q* (-ειν E: -ει, -οι cett.).
q has taken a correction or variant as an addition.
- III. 127 κληται Q (κληται S): β ληται *q*, with α clearly the erased letter (βληται cett.).
q has at first regarded as part of the correction .ο., which *Q* used as a finger-post for his marginal scholium, and has emended it to βαληται, perhaps with some association with βάλλω in his mind; then, seeing its true function, he has erased the vowel.

¹ A converse case of confusion by *q*'s scribe between η and ε, so often closely alike in *Q*, occurs at II. 10, where *q* reads *Q*'s dubious ἰδη (S has ἰδη) as ἰδε. ἰδε μέγας, with ἰδε later in the line, is attractive in view of the similar juxtapositions in I. 55, II. 25 (=80=97=103), and IV. 204; cf. II. 3-5, 109-110, Theocritus, VI. 19, etc. (see Schneider, vol. i. pp. 152-4). For a short final vowel lengthened before μ-cf. III. 55, 61, 150, and the Homeric precedents (Monro, H.G., §§ 371-2).

² Similarly III. 99, προκαλῆσ Q, προκαλῆς *q*. A curious case is VI. 77, καλιξῶ Q, καλιξῶ *q*, where seemingly *q* accepted the correction, but thought κ worth recording (? as a variant); cf. B^r from I at IV. 42.

³ Cf. VI. 77, ἡλθε Q, ἡνθε *q*. *Q* cannot be a copy of *q*; for it has III. 33, which *q* omits owing to homoeographon with 34.

¹ In more
Except these

209 ^γ ἄλογον SQ: ἄλογον q.

ἄλογον is a variant on the ἄλογον of most manuscripts; q fuses the two, as also does Π.

218 κλαλιδωνίου (with the second λ half covering α) Q: κλιδωνίου q (καλιδωνίου S cett.).

Q's confusion results from an attempt to correct α to λ (he has forgotten to make the preceding λ into α); q regards the confusion as an obliteration, and writes the rest without it.

241 ^ε σακέεσιν Q: σακέεσιν by correction q (σακέεσιν S cett.).

q first writes σακέε; then he alters the second ε to σ, which he writes in the same stroke as another σ following, and finishes the word as σακέεσιν; then he goes back on his first σ and makes it ε again.

IV. 207 Q has corrected γαῖT (the τ to start τότ') into γαῖα, but the result looks like γαῖη: hence q's γαῖη (γαῖα S cett.).

V. 124 ἤλιθα καὶ : οὐκ Q, who has erased μάτην, formerly suprascript to ἤλιθα (whence the dots there), but has set it in the margin with dots appended: ἤλιθα καὶ μάτην οὐκ q, with nothing in the margin.

S has ἤλιθα καὶ ^{ποιών} οὐκ: cett. ἤλιθα καὶ ποίων οὐκ. q has inserted Q's marginal gloss after καὶ, on the strength of the dots which he found there.

q rejects Q's variants, corrections, or additions fourteen times, including θυγάτηρ (V. 136) and ΓMσ (V. 139). At VI. 22 he probably gets ὑπερβασίας ἀλέηται (Q ὑπερ alone, an addition in different ink) from the scholium.

q, then, is a copy of Q. The differences between them are slight, minute diversities (chiefly of breathing and accent)¹ totalling 215, while there are 100 of more account. Nearly one-half of the latter have arisen from permutation of letters on q's part; while the following variations seem due to his attempts at correction:

II. 37 ἐπὶ χροοσ Q: ἐπ' ἔχρος q (unmetrical).

107 ὦδε τ' εἶπεν Q: ὁ δέ τ' εἶπεν q (unmetrical).

III. 46 αὐθι δέ Q: αὐτῇ δέ q (unmetrical).

57 τρινακίησι κανῶν Q: τρινακίη σικανῶν q (Τρινακίη Σικανῶν is right).

76 στήθος ἐκ μεγάλου Q: στήθος ἐκ μεγάλου q (still unmetrical; στήθεος cett.).

182 ἐπιστήστας Q: ἐπιστήσας q (codd.).

256 αὐτὸς Q: αὐτὸς q (codd.).

¹ In more than half of these q improves on Q. Except these and four or five successful emendations, noticed below, all his variations from Q are for the worse.

IV. 165 ἐκμοιρέωντις Q: ἐκμοιρέωντες q.
Q's non-division has puzzled q.

176 πείστα Q: πλείστα q (cett.).

234 ἐπὶ πτερὸν Q (cett.): ἐπεὶ πτερὸν q.

265 ἐβάλει Q: ἔβαλε q (unmetrical).

q did not recognize the middle form in -ειν.

V. 41 σὲ δὲ δαίμον ἀπορρώγεσσω ἔθηκεν Q: σὲ δὲ δέμων κτλ. q (unmetrical).

VI. 96 πολιαῖς ἐπὶ χεῖρας ἔβαλλε Q: πολιαῖς ἐπὶ κτλ. q.

99 σεῦτε Q: σεῦται q (unmetrical: σεῦ τε codd.).

Of these, only in III. 57, 182, 256, IV. 176, and perhaps VI. 96, does q emend successfully.

Identification of Schneider's Q.—Schneider (op. cit. pp. xxxv sq.) says: 'Q significat codicem Estensem qui primus innotuit ex Laurentii Santenii editione hymni Callimachei in Apollinem cum L. C. Valckenarii emendationibus ineditis ipsiusque interpretatione Lugd. Bat. 1787 in lucem emissa. Acceperat autem hanc collationem Santenius ex urbe Venetiis, ubi in bibliotheca nobilissimae familiae Estensium codex erat, et Callimachi exemplari Ernestiano adscripserat Valcken. quod nunc in bibliotheca Lugduno-Batava servatur sub O 1004. Sed quum Lucianus Mueller eandem collationem a Valckenario acceptam etiam Ruhnkenium margini editionis suae allevisse uideret, hinc Valckenarianam collationem manu minus commoda et atramento deteriore scriptam et ab I. G. Voeglero descriptam subinde correxit. Ceterum ipse Valckenarius ibi queritur collationem codicis Estensis minus accurate esse institutam.'

What MS. is this? Among those that I have collated the choice lies between S, Q and q. Most of Q¹'s readings,¹ as reported in Schneider's *apparatus*, are common to these three and one or more of the rest;² but the following occur only in SQq: I. 68 θήκας: 94 αἰθις. II. 49 ἐπ' ἔρωτι. III. 4 ἀρχόμενοι καὶ: 19 σπανὸν: 45 ἀμορφούς ('corrected' in S from -βούς): 97 ἐπ' ἴσχιον. IV. 218 ἦρα: 225 αὐτὴν: 229 θεῆς: 257 εἶπας (S's suprascript ον is later): 323 ἀποστρέψαντες (in S a later hand corrects to -ας). V. 104 λίνους. VI. 17 δηοῦς.

The following occur only in Qq: I. 41 γυνὴ (γυνὴ q). II. 61 φορέεσκε. IV. 249 μέλποντος: 256 ἀχαιοιο. V. 74 κατεῖχον. Thus S cannot be Q¹.

At IV. 39 Q¹ is credited with 'ζεῦρα, sed in margine ἢ τέφρα,' and SQ agree; q has ζεῦρα with the marginal τεῦφρα (ῥφρα Ee, and τόφρα cett., without a gloss). A decision in favour of Q as the original of the Q¹ extracts is obtained from III. 238, where Schneider says 'παρραλή Q, sed correctum'; for while S has παρραλή, and q παρράλη, Q gives παρράλη (παρραλή or παραλή cett.). At VI. 116 Schneider ascribes ὅστις to Q¹: S has ὅς τοι, Q ὅς τις, q ὅστις (sic). Here Q's uncorrected text has been chosen by the extractor.

¹ I call Schneider's citations Q¹ here to avoid confusion.

² E.g. Q¹ omits II. 27 with SQq.

In twenty-one out of eighty-five citations of Q^1 in Schneider, readings are given which agree neither with S , Q , nor q . The discrepancies, most of which are slight, may be due to misreadings on the part of the extractor, or mistakes of Schneider or his informant. In ten instances we find a divergence of one letter; in five others, differences of breathing, word-division, or *iota subscr.* Of the rest, III. 238 has just been mentioned. At VI. 12, Q^1 's ἐλόεσσα does not fit SQq (οὐδὲ λοέσσω) nor any other extant MS.; probably it is a mis-citation of VI. 16 *ad fin.*, where SQq have οὐδὲ λοέσσα. Similarly, at VI. 84 Q^1 's εἰλαπιναστής fits no MS., and probably should have been given as from VI. 87, where SQq and others have εἰλαπιναστής. Q 's uncorrected reading is followed at III. 99, where Q^1 has προκαλῆς, Q προ^μκαλῆς (q προ^μκαλῆς: S προμολῆς); and at IV. 282 Q^1 has ὀρκιαθινὸς for the distinctive ὀρκία θιν^ονδ of Q (ὀρκία θιν^ονδς Sq : οἰκία θινὸς *cett.*). At V. 65 Q^1 has ἐπεβόσατο, Q ἐπεροά^σατο (from S 's ἐπεβόσατο: q ἐπεροάσατο).

M. T. SMILEY.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL.

(To be continued.)

CLASSICS AND CITIZENSHIP.

As the black clouds of war lift from the surface of the Continents of Europe and Nearer Asia, the eye looks round upon a shattered civilization. The once busy tide of labour on the field and in the factory, beneath the soil and within dock, ebbs slowly away; the accustomed rewards of toil, food, warmth and clothing, become daily more difficult of attainment. Authority trembles in its seat, and money loses its once all-powerful attraction. Inevitably the scholar recalls the tale of the Decline and Fall of the Roman-Hellenistic world, and calculates the prospect of a second millennium of darkness and suffering. And he is not unconscious that he stands himself accused of having brought about, or at least failed to avert, the doom of the nations. For, he is told, the governing classes of all the nations that clashed in mutual destructiveness were constituted of men brought up in the classical tradition, whose minds in their fresh boyhood were fed on the so-called glories of Alexander the Great and of Julius Caesar, and who sought in rivalry to win, each for his nation, the haughty supremacy of imperial Rome. And he hears the clamour of those who demand a clean sweep of the false ideals and selfish ambitions of the past, and the building upon new foundations of a world of contentment and peace, inspired by the basic conception of a citizenship in which no man shall seek his own gain at the cost of another's loss. Towards the building up of this new world, it is claimed, the study of the past can do nothing to help; by effacing itself it will cease to be a hindrance. And in response to this accusation there arise in all directions schemes for a reconstructed world, a reconstituted nation, and a new education, which shall be alike in this one point—that they take for granted the elimination of the study of antiquity and the disappearance of the atmosphere of the Humanities.

To reply to an accusation which is at once so sweeping and so ill-defined, which is based so much upon temperament and so little on facts, is not an easy task. But it may seem not unfitting at this time that a classical journal, one unit in a community which not so long ago linked together every one of the nations which have taken part in the war, and which are now, in name at least, united in peace, should make the attempt to restate in general terms the story of the past in its bearing upon the serious problems of the world to-day. For classical study has never been contented to be the relaxation of the curious or the lamp of the past: it has always been inspired by the sense

of a mission
the artistic
also on the
Holy Roman
welding to
War is to
make that

Such
at this mo
achieve w
to Hellas
this we ha
Empires o
day. It is
citizenship
great achie
is illumina
more in t
established
winning t
those who
the city is
the citizen
officers m
action, eve
in its insti
ments of s

But it
for nation
valour of
scholar se
investigati
the city s
nation. M
of antiqui
a dozen c
earlier pe
citizenship
ship upon
was taken
to-day no
citizenship

¹ *Our Rev*
Professor of

of a mission still awaiting its conclusion. It bases its claims not merely on the artistic brilliancy of Athens and the world-wide reign of Roman law, but also on the international crusade of the Catholic Church, the idealism of the Holy Roman Empire, the reawakening of Europe in the Renaissance, and the welding together of India through the British Peace. If the story of the World War is to be counted as a failure of Classical Humanism, it still aspires to make that failure good.

Such a point of view is in substance adopted in a striking book which is at this moment before the writer.¹ Fully admitting the failure of Greece to achieve what we call 'national unity,' the author points out how we owe to Hellas the love of civic freedom and pride in municipal achievement. In this we have a vital principle which at most only existed in germ in the great Empires of the East, but has retained its force in every part of Europe to this day. It is not without reason that men's minds ever recur to the idea of citizenship and the conception of civic duty. But this citizenship itself is the great achievement of Hellas, and that not only in the fifth century B.C., which is illuminated by the genius of the Greek dramatists and historians, but even more in the three or four preceding centuries, in which Greek cities were established over a great area in Middle Europe and Asia Minor, everywhere winning the allegiance of native peoples who had no near tie of blood with those who established their colonies amongst them. Citizenship apart from the city is a shapeless dream; and the European city of to-day, based upon the citizen-voter, directed by the elected council, and having for its executive officers magistrates who can be called to account for their administrative action, everywhere continues the tradition of the city-state of Greece, not only in its instinctive opposition to personal rule,² but also in its positive achievements of social equality and practical care for the humblest.

But if Hellas in its preoccupation for civic liberty failed to lay the basis for national union, it is the glory of Rome to have filled the gap. Not in the valour of its soldiers nor in the sternness of its organization does the modern scholar see the peculiar genius of Rome, but in its persistent work, open to our investigation during a period of ten centuries, in developing the conception of the city state into that League of Cities which is the basis of the modern nation. Nowhere could the soil have seemed less favourable. The Italy of antiquity was peopled by Latins, Samnites, Etruscans, Gauls, Greeks, and a dozen other races separated by history, language, and religion, and in the earlier period penetrated by mutual hatred. Each time that the Roman citizenship was bestowed upon a town inhabited by Latins, the Latin citizenship upon Gauls, the Italian rights on Africans or Illyrians, a step forward was taken in the welding together of the civilized world. The historian of to-day no longer sees in the law of Caracalla, which extended the Roman citizenship to all free men within the circle of Roman rule, an artifice to

¹ *Our Renaissance*, by Henry Browne, S.J., Longmans, Green and Co., 1917.
Professor of Greek in University College, Dublin.

² *Ib.* p. 69.

enlarge the area of taxation; he recognizes it as the inevitable climax to the civilizing work of the centuries that had gone before.

A world which looks yearningly towards a League of all the Nations cannot make it a reproach to Roman statesmanship that it hitched its car to the ideal of the World City or Cosmopolis. Towards this lofty aim it contributed, not only by its victories in the field, but also amidst its defeats. Each time that the barbarians burst through its frontier defences, they came within the attraction of Roman civilization and of Roman principles of law. The proudest achievement of ancient Germany is not that she defeated the legions of Varus, but that for the whole of the fifth century she was the protectress of the fading majesty of Rome.

Rome declined, decayed, and fell; but where in history do we find immortality? She fell in the achievement of a mighty task, and doubtless the vices and violences of individuals helped to her fall. But never do we find a fallen Empire so sincerely lamented. The essence of the history of medieval Christianity on its secular side is the ideal of the restoration of the international power of Rome in the person of its Bishop; and the barbarian invaders who swept aside the Roman armies and barely tolerated the sound of the Latin language never found a higher political ideal than that of the Holy Roman Empire of German nation. The British Empire, of which we have the right to speak without shame, has in India at least developed mainly on the lines of Roman government, and under the guidance of men steeped in the atmosphere of Classical Humanism.

If the more obvious facts of ancient history point to the achievements of Rome in political organization, those that modern research is bringing to the front point to her progressive work in the relations of classes and the organization of trades. In the Roman trade societies the ideal of social equality reached its perfection: even between the slave and the free men there was no longer a distinction of rank. Not less was the trade society inspired by the enthusiasm of service for the public good, and if the organizations seldom develop beyond the area of each city, at least the splendour and prosperity of the city were included amongst the objects of all.

There are those amongst us who aspire to rebuild a tottering world upon the basis of natural science; who trace in the history of plants and insects a biological law which, as they aver, must control human life also, or who identify human progress with the conquest of Nature in the fields of chemistry or mechanics. Others look to the speculations of philosophy or the records of medieval nationalities for social principles more immediately applicable. It would ill become any humanist to shut his eyes to the wisdom that it can be drawn from these studies; but it may perhaps be urged that there is not one of them which has not contributed more to bring about the great catastrophe than the misapplication of classical study, and that the latter stands in closer touch than any of them with the real problems of modern society. It is not without reason that the most sincere of the

fanaticisms
'dictatorshi
the rival co
no fanciful
must open
already qu
can men a
ancients.
brute creati
chiefly our

¹ H. Brown
A more comp
points now ra

To disc
writing a l
Class. Quar
Bacch. 1106
B.B.' (Class
which are in
not be the v
to alter the
eminent of
unfortunate
Professor L
or a misin
considered;
given correc
less. Profe
evidence of
unfortunate

4. SION I
B.

fanaticisms of to-day oscillates between the ideals of 'autocracy' and the 'dictatorship of the proletariat,' for modern political thought is rooted in the rival conceptions of the Hellenistic and the Roman worlds. It is therefore no fanciful claim that any serious study of citizenship in a modern University must open up an outlook into classical antiquity. In the words of the writer already quoted: 'What we maintain is that in none of the problems of life can men afford to lose sight of the storehouse bequeathed to them by the ancients. In the complexus of everything which differentiates man from the brute creation, the voice of antiquity must be heard, and by antiquity we mean chiefly our own mental and moral forbears, the Greeks and Romans.'¹

E. V. ARNOLD.

¹ H. Browne, *Our Renaissance*, pp. 149, 150. A more complete treatment of some of the points now raised will be found in the article

by Professor R. S. Conway on 'Education and Freedom' (*Contemporary Review*, June, 1917).

ADNOTATIVNCVLA PLAVTINA.

To discuss Professor Lindsay's doctrine of 'Breves Breviantes' would involve writing a long article, for which there is no space in the April number of the *Class. Quart.* But it would be wrong in me to pass his treatment of Plaut. *Bacch.* 1106 by without comment. What he calls 'a sane view of the law of B.B.' (*Class. Quart.* for January, p. 50) involves the emendation of a number of lines which are in other respects quite above suspicion. In these circumstances would it not be the wiser course to reconsider the supposed 'sane law' rather than to attempt to alter the text so as to make it fit a law which is not admitted by some of the most eminent of modern critics (e.g. Seyffert and Skutsch)? Emendation is particularly unfortunate in this instance, because the metre is anapaestic, and the suggestion of Professor Lindsay that the word *Philoxene* may be 'a gloss to indicate the speaker or a misinterpretation of some marginal indication of a speaker' is surely ill-considered; for the speaker is Nicobulus, and the speakers of adjacent lines are given correctly, so far as I see, in the MSS. Such a gloss would, then, be meaningless. Professor Lindsay's attempt at emendation of this line is, in fact, striking evidence of the bankruptcy of the 'sane view' of iambic shortening to which he has unfortunately committed himself.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

4, SION HILL PLACE,
BATH.

ΠΑΛΙΝΤΟΝΟΝ AND ΕΥΘΥΤΟΝΟΝ

GREAT advances have been made of late years in the understanding of ancient artillery, but the difference between the *παλίντονον* and the *εὐθύτονον* seems to remain a riddle still inviting solution. In tentatively accepting the invitation, we are met at the outset by a certain amount of fog due to the fact that ancient guns were classed by two methods which produce a cross division. It will pay us to dispel this fog, or at any rate to find our bearings in it as exactly as may be, before going further.

Guns were classed (a) as *λιθοβόλοι* and *ὀξυβελεῖς* (sc. *μηχαναί*) according as the missile discharged was stone or bolt; (b) as *παλίντονα* and *εὐθύτονα* (sc. *ὄργανα*) according to a structural difference regarded up to the present as mysterious.

Hero (*Belop.* 3) gives data for getting at the relation between the two systems:

τῶν οὖν εἰρημένων ὀργάνων τὰ μὲν ἔστιν εὐθύτονα τὰ δὲ παλίντονα. καλεῖται δὲ εὐθύτονα ἅ τινες καὶ σκορπίους καλοῦσιν ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ τὸ σχῆμα ὁμοιότητος. τὰ μὲν εὐθύτονα ὀιστοὺς μόνους ἀφίησι· τὰ δὲ παλίντονα ἔνιοι καὶ λιθοβόλα καλοῦσι διὰ τὸ λίθους ἐξαποστέλλειν ἢ καὶ ὀιστοὺς πέμπειν ἢ καὶ συναμφότερα.

Later on (*ib.* 30) in mentioning slight differences of rig suited for stone or bolt respectively, Hero himself uses *παλίντονον* and *εὐθύτονον* as equivalents of *λιθοβόλος* and *ὀξυβελής*:

ἡ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ εὐθυτόνου (sc. *τοξίτης*) στρογγύλη γίνεται, ἐπεὶ περ εἰς τὴν τοῦ ὀιστοῦ ἐμπίπτει χιλήν . . . ἡ δὲ τοῦ παλιντόνου πλαγία γίνεται καθάπερ ζώνη . . . τό τε πλάτος τῆς τοξίτιδος ὀρθὸν τίθεται ὅπως ὁ λίθος κατὰ τὸ πλάτος ὑπὸ τῆς τοξίτιδος τυφθεὶς καλῶς ἐξαποστέλλεται.

Later still (*ib.* 32) speaking of certain principles of dimension, he makes a cross division:

δεῖ οὖν τὸ τοῦ λιθοβόλου ὀργάνου τρῆμα συνίστασθαι οὕτως· ὅσων ἂν ᾖ μῶν ὁ μέλλων ἐξαποστέλλεσθαι λίθος κτλ. . . . τὸ δὲ τοῦ εὐθυτόνου τρῆμα συνίσταται ὅσων ἂν ἔχῃ μῆκος τὸ μέλλον ἐξαποστέλλεσθαι βέλος κτλ.

Philo is altogether one of Hero's *ἔνιοι*. He gives (IV. 6-12) detailed scales of dimension, calculated from the weight of the shot, for *ὄργανα* *λιθοβολικά*, and others, from the length of the bolt, for *ὀξυβελῆ*. An examination of the terms used shows that he identifies these with the *παλίντονα* and *εὐθύτονα* of Hero, though he never employs the actual words. Elsewhere, however (V. p. 91, 35 ed. Th.), he gives us an allusion: *καὶ τοῖς πετροβόλοις ἄνω βάλλοντας τοῖς παλιντόνοις καὶ τοῖς μονάγκωσι*.

No other
Hero is
contemporan
and will be
till he has m
and also de
examined) b
identification
artillerists; a
are like, but
so forth: sp
of the ordin
progressive c
fed with bol
day and con

Taking
παλίντονα w
εὐθύτονα, bu
with *πετροβ*
you (even as
there was li
were *παλίντ*

Whethe
or bolt but l
or that certa
deciding. I
crucial pass
length the
adaptations,
spring-frame
and horizon
frame and a
σύριγξ, with
and some l
πάντα τὰ α
σύγκειται ἀ

Now th
then we ac
fair treatm
provided wi
aim. That
Next v
παλίντονον
mark?

No other author seems to add to our knowledge.

Hero is apparently writing for the intelligent layman curious about contemporary artillery, who will want a description of the build and the parts, and will be interested in principles and development—not overdone. It is not till he has made the distinct statement first quoted, has given his descriptions, and also defined beyond fear of mistake the difference (to be presently examined) between *παλίντονα* and *εὐθύτονα*, that he indulges in the loose identification and cross-division noticed. Philo seems to be writing for artillerists; at any rate his people will know what the machines and their parts are like, but will be glad to have scales in detail and hints on management and so forth: specially glad they will be (one sees a certain hurry in his treatment of the ordinary forms) to arrive at information on the newest and most progressive devices—the metal-spring and air-spring guns, and the quick-firer fed with bolts from a hopper. Such readers will not be misled by an everyday and convenient, though approximate, classification.

Taking all into account, then, we arrive at this conclusion. Most *παλίντονα* were *πετροβόλα*, but some were *ὀξυβελῆ*, and most *ὀξυβελῆ* were *εὐθύτονα*, but some were *παλίντονα*. However, the coincidence of *παλίντονα* with *πετροβόλοι* and *εὐθύτονα* with *ὀξυβελεῖς* was sufficiently marked to justify you (even as an artillerist) in equating them when speaking loosely or when there was little fear of mistake. Quite exclusively, moreover, all *πετροβόλοι* were *παλίντονοι* and all *εὐθύτονα* were *ὀξυβελῆ*.

Whether Hero, in saying that *παλίντονα* discharged not only either shot or bolt but both, meant that any such gun could be used for both at a pinch, or that certain guns were adjustable for both purposes, we have no means of deciding. In this direction we have done all we can. We now turn to the crucial passage of Hero and attack the main question. He has described at length the make of the *γαστραφέτης*, and of its *σύριγξ* which, with certain adaptations, belongs to the more elaborate pieces also; an early form of spring-frame for the torsion-gun; the stand, swivelled vertically for lateral aim and horizontally for elevation, on which the guns were mounted; the spring-frame and adjustment of springs in the *παλίντονον*; a variant (*κλιμακίς*) on the *σύριγξ*, with which the *παλίντονον* is provided (apparently for lightness sake), and some lesser matters. Then he says (c. 26) τὰ δὲ εὐθύτονα τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πάντα τὰ αὐτὰ ἔχει τῷ παλιντόνῳ πλην ὅτι τὰ δύο ἡμιτόνια εἰς ἓν πλωθίον σύγκειται ἀπέχοντα ἀλλήλων τὸ τῆς διώστρας πλάτος.

Now this is plain enough. Are we to take his word for it? If we do, then we accept one most important point which has not always received fair treatment: that all guns whether *παλίντονα* or *εὐθύτονα* were equally provided with a swivelled stand, allowing differences of elevation and of lateral aim. That is a great matter, in view of theories which have been held.

Next what, in more detail, is the difference in structure between the *παλίντονον* and the *εὐθύτονον* which Hero names as the distinguishing mark?

It is this. In the *παλίντονον* each spring has its own frame (*ἡμιτόνιον*), separately built, consisting of two bore-beams (*περίτρητα*) top and bottom, a side-post (*παραστάτης*) forming the outer side of the frame when the gun is assembled, and a counter-post (*ἀντιστάτης*) forming the inner side and facing, as its name implies, the *ἀντιστάτης* of the complementary spring-frame on the other side of the *κλιμακίς*. The two frames are then placed and fixed upon a bed (*τράπεζα*) and secured at the top by two wooden coupling-bars (*κανόνες*). For transport the whole structure was usually taken to pieces except the actual spring-frames (*ἡμιτόνια*).

In the *εὐθύτονον*, on the other hand, both springs are in a single frame (*πλινθίον*), consisting of a beam top and bottom, each comprising in itself bore-beams and bed or couplers, two side-posts, one at each end, outside the springs, and two mid-posts (*μεσοστάται*, no longer *ἀντιστάται*) between the springs, at a distance from each other allowing for the breadth of the *διώστρα* or the *σύριγξ*.

And the upshot of it all is that we have two guns of an exactly similar principle, differing only in an apparently unimportant structural detail, or the fact that the whole power-frame of one is a degree more discernible than that of the other.

It is hard at first to see that there is enough in this to account for the classification; yet we are bound either to allow that there is, or to throw over the only direct evidence we have. Rüstow and Köchly found themselves forced, rather than assent, to adopt a highly curious *argumentum ex silentio*. Since Hero mentions nothing sufficiently striking to account for the classification, this classification, they argued, must accordingly be based on a difference so glaring that Hero did not think it worth while to mention it. The difference they evolved, with thinking upon the word *παλίντονος* and certain more general grounds, was this: the *κλιμακίς* of the *παλίντονον* raked downwards, at an angle of forty-five degrees from the vertical, from the frame to the ground, where it was fastened to a projecting foot of the stand. The *παλίντονον* was thus adapted for high-angle fire only, and at a fixed angle. They conceived that they found corroboration of this in Philo's scales for *λιθοβόλοι* and *ὀξυβελείς*. Now first, the longer one looks at the word *παλίντονος*, the more one wonders how a deflection of the *κλιμακίς* has anything to do with it. Next one sees that having assumed Hero a fool in their *argumentum ex silentio*, they give him the lie direct by doing away with ranging-gear for the *παλίντονον*, while their corroborative matter requires the adoption, for purposes of precise distinction, of an equation which is only approximate. Finally they have credited an era of very acute artillerymen with a machine whose waste of power (quite avoidable) is obvious without resort to formulae. They might have been left alone had not this view coloured, and were it not still colouring, opinions on the point. It is to be feared that when, with or without the decency of an 'it has been conjectured,' enquirers are, as usually, informed that *παλίντονα* were built for plunging fire and *εὐθύτονα* for point-blank range

or thereabout perhaps, to

Let us g
were provide
with a slight
ever tried to
something li
exact meani
account is su
and 'simple
and *εὐθύς*.

of the gun
εὐθύτονον, h
be called a
all torsion-p
εὐθύτονον is
not so great
distinct from

We hav
except the s
the *γαστραφ*
we can here
are never su
preliminary
may be sure
power must

In oth
obviously ne
rather crude
and the *μον*
adapted *μο*
directions, c
the force of
very like it,
first double
being called
very heavy.
μονάγκων, th
between the
not surpris
transport in
in the best

¹ It seems u
view (due to R

or thereabout, this is the old, uneasy spirit that speaks, too groundless, perhaps, to find a grave.

Let us get back to our evidence, which plainly tells us both classes of gun were provided with identical aiming-gear, and both were identical in principle, with a slight structural difference. Here the key really does lie. If we have ever tried to translate *παλίντονος* and *εὐθύτονος*, we have probably evolved something like 'back-sprung' and 'straight-sprung,' with reservations as to its exact meaning. But to trust Hero and check the words honestly by his account is surely to find that the only translations possible are 'counter-sprung,' and 'simple-sprung'—involving nothing but equally orthodox senses of *πάλιν* and *εὐθύς*. *Παλίντονος*, in fact, defines perfectly the action of the two springs of the gun working in opposite directions to produce their effect. The *εὐθύτονον*, however, worked in exactly the same way: should it not therefore be called a *παλίντονον* too? The answer seems to be that, as a matter of fact, all torsion-pieces except the *μονάγκων* were in principle *παλίντονα*: the name *εὐθύτονον* is not in origin antithetic or exclusive, but the sign of a modification not so great in itself as important in that it was the mark of light artillery as distinct from the heavies.

We have little to guide us on the early development of ancient artillery, except the statement of Hero that the double-spring gun was developed out of the *γαστραφέτης*, the torsion-principle displacing that of the elastic bow. But we can here supply with safety a detail omitted by Hero. Great inventions are never such leaps as they look: there has always been a tentative stage—preliminary tinkering, perhaps for a generation or so, perhaps more: hence we may be sure that before its complex application to the double-spring, torsion-power must have been showing itself effective in simpler devices.

In other words, the primary torsion-gun was the *μονάγκων* (though obviously not then called *μονάγκων*), the one-armed inaccurate lobber, in some rather crude form.¹ The double-spring gun was the issue of the *γαστραφέτης* and the *μονάγκων*. We do not know when or by whom it was seen that two adapted *μονάγκωνες*, placed edgeways up, coupled and working in opposite directions, could be made to work a cord like the elastic bow, and so combine the force of the torsion-piece with the bow's precision, but this, or something very like it, must have been the course of development, and would lead to the first double-spring pieces (regarded as two distinct complementary machines) being called *παλίντονα*. Now ancient artillery was an affair of stout timbers, very heavy. We see why, when we learn that Schramm's reconstructed *μονάγκων*, throwing a ball of about four pounds, developed a tension of sixty tons between the sides of its frame when strung for action. Consequently we are not surprised to find that the original structure proved its value, for ease of transport in sections, in the case of the heavier pieces, and is still to be found in the best period of artillery, carrying with it, more or less as a survival, a

¹ It seems unnecessary now to combat the old view (due to Rüstow and Köchly again) that the *μονάγκων* was a late invention: it is accepted now as known in all periods of ancient artillery.

nomenclature (παλίντονον, ἀντιστάται) preserving the early idea of the new-fangled double-spring guns.

But in the case of lighter pieces the old construction was seen to be needless: it was obviously far simpler to make the spring-frame in one piece and do away with a complexity only justified by the transport problem in the case of the heavies. With this change passed away entirely for these pieces the old notion of the gun as two complementary halves: ἀντιστάται became μεσοσ-τάται, and because by comparison with the composite form the new frame was a simple, slick, straight-forward piece of work, the gun was dubbed εὐθύτονον, the 'simple-springer.'

If this view be correct it is easily seen where the difficulty of interpretation comes in, for παλίντονον refers back to an early conception of the relation of such guns to the μονάγκων,¹ while εὐθύτονον stands in contrast not with anything in the word παλίντονον, but with the complexity of the build: their meaning depends half on relationships not apparent in the words themselves. Indeed we may suspect that even for the Greeks themselves as time went on and the original associations grew blurred, the full meaning of the terms became the property of the specialist and the terms themselves more or less learned—not directly descriptive—to the ordinary man. In these circumstances what lent them vitality was the fact that they did, as already pointed out, mark in practice something more obvious than the difference of build, namely the heavy and the light gun, though again without being properly descriptive. But another distinction equally evident to the eye was meanwhile producing powerful competitors in another pair of names, which besides marking the distinction were also descriptive—λιθοβόλος and ὀξυβελής. We find the popular pair apparently making preparations to swallow the learned by a preliminary assimilation, not more than comfortably inaccurate in view of the fact that all λιθοβόλοι were παλίντονοι and most ὀξυβελεῖς εὐθύτονοι. This at least would explain our authors' anomalies of nomenclature.

E. PHILLIPS BARKER.

¹ Whether the passage of Philo (V. p. 91, 35 ed. Th.), cited above, carries the full implication can hardly be decided.

NOTES

THE A
apparently
explanations
mentators s
much large
visible in t
glossaries b
It is reason
which are f
from glossar
though they
Lindsay, C.
principles h
individual i

Follow
sub patente
rather ' <st
512 or VIII
24, 15
and Schol.
72, 29
cussus uagi
gloss appea
given here
'Fauonius'
(C.G.L. V.
(Vat. 3321,
radius,' etc
'Fauonius'
incertae Ze
served by C
at Geo. II.
or scholiast
turbs the b
have been
ought then

NOTES ON THE ABTRVSA GLOSSARY AND THE *LIBER GLOSSARVM.*

THE Abstrusa glossary consists to a great extent of glosses extracted apparently from the margins of a Virgil MS., which contained not merely explanations of difficult words but many long scholia taken from ancient commentators such as Donatus and Servius. In its original form it was probably much larger than it appears in *C.G.L.* IV. The process of curtailment is visible in the MSS. we possess. Moreover, the *Liber Glossarum* and other glossaries borrowed freely from it, and often show its glosses in a fuller form. It is reasonable to suppose that many glosses of the kind described above, which are found in the *Liber Glossarum* (with the sign DE GLS., i.e. 'taken from glossaries') and sometimes elsewhere, belonged to the Abstrusa glossary, though they do not appear in the edition of it which has survived. (See Lindsay, *C.Q.* XI. 120 sqq.) Some of the following notes will show how these principles help to clear up difficulties which arise in the investigation of individual items.

I. Abstrusa (*C.G.L.* IV. 3-198).

Following 23, 54 one of the 'pure Abstrusa' MSS. has: 'axe sub dio sub patente caelo.' Goetz (*Thes. Gloss.*) makes the lemma 'axe sub dio.' Read rather '<sub aetheris> axe: sub dio (or diuo), sub patente caelo' (*Aen.* II. 512 or VIII. 28).

24, 15 'Baccare: herba iucundior.' Read 'iucundi odoris.' Cf. Philarg. and Schol. Bern. on *Ecl.* IV. 19.

72, 29 'Fauonius solis radius qui nonnumquam uitro aut argento repercussus uagi ac tremuli fulgoris aemula claritate resplendet.' This strange gloss appears (with greater or less corruption) in several glossaries. It is given here as corrected by Loewe. In *Lib. Gloss.* 197, 21 it runs thus: 'Fauonius uentus fauonius dicitur etiam solis radius,' etc. In Cod. Leid. 67 E (*C.G.L.* V. 643, 33), a glossary closely connected with Abstrusa and Abolita (*Vat.* 3321, *C.G.L.* IV. *praef.* p. x), the form is: 'Fauonius etiam dicitur solis radius,' etc. One inevitably thinks of *Aen.* VIII. 22 sqq., but how does 'Fauonius' come in? The true source may be a note on *Ecl.* V. 5, 'siue sub incertas Zephyris motantibus umbras,' and I suggest that the true form is preserved by Cod. Leidensis. 'Fauonius' is a gloss on 'Zephyris,' as in Servius at *Geo.* II. 330. Virgil speaks of the flickering shadows. Some commentator or scholiast, thinking rather of the sunlight dancing as the wind constantly disturbs the branches of the trees, is reminded of *Aen.* VIII. 22 sqq. There may have been a longer note dealing with Virgil's 'light effects.' The scholium ought then to take this form: 'Zephyrus: Fauonius. Etiam dicitur' (=is

spoken of), etc. But the compiler of the glossary transferred the note to his page without its lemma (perhaps because the lemma was not given in the margin). The loss of a lemma is generally due to a transcriber, but there are cases where it seems to go back to the archetype. *Lib. Gloss.* here supplies a head to the gloss, without improving the sense.

102, 31 'Iurat leges decreta aut iustitia uel tractatus.' This is the reading of *Vat.* 3321, and *Thes. Gloss.* leaves it so, only printing 'iura' for 'iurat' as the lemma. Goetz's two 'pure Abstrusa' MSS. have 'tractum' and omit 'uel.' Read 'Iura: leges, decreta, a iustitia tractum.' For the derivation cf. Isidore *Etym.* V. 3, 1 'ius autem dictum quia iustum.'

II. *Liber Glossarum* (C.G.L. V. 161-255).

186, 7 'Coturnus uenaticum et agreste calciamentum est, quia un[i]us pedi utrique conuenit, unde si quis duobus discordantibus fuerit amicus, coturnus dicitur.' This reads as if the fact that one cothurnus fits either foot were the reason why it is worn by hunters and country people. But a clause has dropped out before 'quia,' as we see from Servius on *Ecl.* VII. 32: 'ideo singulari usus est numero quia hoc genus calciamenti utrique aptum est pedi.' Cf. Serv. on *Aen.* I. 337.

186, 14 'Crateres duos: uasa uinaria, sed masculinum est.' Read 'crateras' (*Ecl.* V. 68.) 'It looks like a feminine, but it is masculine, for Virgil is using the Greek form *crater*, not the Latin *cratera*.' This must have been the gist of the original note. Cf. Serv. on *Aen.* I. 724.

189, 5 'Denicalibus feriis: apud paganos erant eae feriae, quando aquam non licebat inducere agris paratis ob honorem nympharum.' Read 'agris aut pratis.' Cf. Serv. 'Dan.' on *Geo.* I. 270: 'quoniam cautum in libris sacris est, "feriis denicalibus aquam in pratum ducere nisi legitimam non licet."'

195, 34 'Excetra secunda est uelut in exhaustae malitiae hoc est ydram quem ueteres nominarunt.'

196, 5 (=Abstr. 70, 22) 'Excetra plena malitia hoc est hydra (ira *codd.*) quam ueteres canapum nominarunt.'

The first as well as the second of these items belongs to Abstrusa, for it stands truncated at Abstr. 65, 41 'Estidram quam ueteres canapum nominarunt.' (Housman, *J. of P.* XX. p. 50.) Taking 'excetra' as the lemma, Goetz suggests 'fecunda' for 'secunda.' But both glosses can be referred to Virgil.

196, 5. I would assign to *Aen.* VI. 287 'belua Lernaee,' where Servius gives 'excetra' as Latin for 'Hydra.' The words 'belua Lernaee' stand at the end of the line, and the scholium had no lemma. The same applies to 195, 34, on *Aen.* VI. 576 'quingenta atris immanis hiatibus Hydra | saeuior intus habet sedem,' where again 'Hydra' is at the end of the line. This Hydra is excetra *secunda*, for the first was mentioned at line 287. (The two Hydras were a difficulty. Servius on line 576 says: 'Megaeram significat . . . Multi¹ ipsam

¹ Multi may well cover Donatus.

Hydrum u
dixit "ac
exhaustae
malitia' of
got mispla

The s

195, 34 an
points to '
ab aqua ue

287: 'nam

'canopum,

Theander's

with a glo

very conui

which form

supplies a

French 'h

'hnapf,' m

pus.' Cf.

understand

wrote 'cha

In any

which hav

stand thus

195,

Hydrum a

malitia, h

of the 'pu

parently b

212,

(*Thes. Glos*

pendio ma

magisque.

to the rel

fandum,' a

unius ob

pro infan

figura qua

215,

aurataque

gloss may

where Ser

caelatis la

11

Hydrum uolunt, quod non procedit, nam eam in aditu legimus inferorum ubi dixit "ac belua Lernaë." Goetz's 'fecunda' is thus needless. 'Velut inexhaustae malitiae' is meant to be a stronger expression than the 'plena malitia' of the first Hydra, corresponding to Virgil's 'saeuior.' The two glosses got misplaced in the compilation or subsequent rearrangement of the glossary.

The second half, however, has still to be explained. Here, at *Lib. Gloss.* 195, 34 and *Abstr.* 65, 41, we have the accusative 'hydrum,' which perhaps points to 'Hydrum <ab a>qua,' and, if we could ignore 'canapum,' 'Hydrum ab aqua ueteres nominarunt' would be a likely gloss. Cf. Servius on *Aen.* VI. 287: 'nam hydra ab aqua dicta est.' 'Canapum' (it appears variously as 'canopum,' 'conapum,' 'canaphum,' 'canuprum') is unknown to the lexicons. Theander's suggestion (*AA Glossarum Commentarioli*, p. 41) of contamination with a gloss 'exedra: canapium' (a form of 'conopeum') is possible, but not very convincing. What I have to offer is, I fear, hardly more so. A glossary which forms part of the contents of *Cod. Vat. Reg.* 215 (written at Laon in 876) supplies a word 'hanappus' (*C.G.L.* V. 583, 8) which is the forerunner of the French 'hanap,' Italian '(a)nappo,' and is itself a Teutonic loan-word (O.H.G. 'hnapi,' modern 'Napf'), so that it might appear as 'chanappus' or even 'canappus.' Cf. 'Chatti' (Hessen), 'Catti.' I suggest that some one who did not understand the application of the gloss and confused 'hydrum' with 'hydrium' wrote 'chanappum' or 'canappum,' and that so it got into the body of the note.

In any case, this clause probably belonged only to one of the two glosses, which have been assimilated in transcription; and, if I am right, they should stand thus:

195, 34 '(Hydra) excetra secunda est uelut inexhaustae malitiae. Hydrum ab aqua ueteres nominarunt.' 196, 5 '(Belua Lernaë:) excetra plena malitia, hoc est Hydra.' (At *Abstr.* 70, 22, *Vat.* 3321, the oldest MS., and one of the 'pure Abstrusa' MSS., do not have the extra clause, but that is apparently by omission.)

212, 2 'Inpandum nota esse aduerbium ut Donatus dicit.' Goetz. (*Thes. Gloss.*) reads 'impendio,' and refers to Donatus on *Ter. Eun.* 587 'impendio magis animus gaudebat.' The comment of Donatus there is 'magis magisque.' Remembering the plausible suggestion of Rand (*C.Q.* X. 158) as to the relation between Servius and Donatus, we should rather read 'infandum,' and refer to such a line as *Aen.* I. 251 'nauibis (infandum) amissis unius ob iram,' where Servius takes 'infandum' with 'amissis': 'infandum pro infande posuit . . . item "toruumque repente clamat" pro torue, et est figura quae fit quotiens nomen pro aduerbio ponitur.'¹

215, 21 'Laquearibus: legitur et lacunaribus. Lucretius "laqueata aurataque tecta." Read 'lacuaribus' (for 'lacunaribus') and 'lacuata.' The gloss may be assigned to *Aen.* I. 726 'dependent lychni laquearibus aureis,' where Serv. 'Dan.' says: 'legitur et lacuaribus. Cicero Tusculanarum "tectis caelatis lacuatis"' (*Tusc.* I, 85; 3, 44 from Ennius). (There seems to be no

¹ I find that Goetz suggested this view in his *Der Liber Glossarum* (1891), p. 277.

trace of these forms in our MSS. either of Lucretius or of Cicero.) Did the original Donatus commentary give two examples, of which one has been preserved in the glossary, the other in the (abridged) Servius-Donatus?

217, 10 'Leuia: lenia ut Donatus.' *Thes. Gloss.* takes this as 'lēuia.' Surely rather 'lēuia' (*Aen.* VII. 349 *leuia pectora*).

238, 1 'Qualos corbes colaque prelorum per quos mustus fluit, a colando dicta.' The gloss on 'qualos' is merely 'corbes' (*Geo.* II. 241). Cf. 237, 46 'qualos: corbes quibus uuae portantur.' 'Colaqua prelorum' is a new lemma (line 242).

240, 23 'Remugiunt rapidus extus feruens.' Read 'Remugiunt: <clamant.> Rapidus: aestu feruens' (e.g. *Geo.* I. 424).

243, 9 'Scatebris: scaturiginibus, scatit enim aqua dum in sicco et arido quasi bullit; hoc facit et cum erumpit uenis et cum auide sorbetur.'

'Temperat: rusticus scilicet.'

'Scatebris: ideo excetra dicta est hydra quod scateret percussa in multitudinem capitum. Sic Plautus multorum penium receptatricem uel malam ancillam excetram <dicit> quod ab ea uenena scateant.'

In this way we should divide what stands in the glossary without break or division. It shows three notes from a 'uariorum' commentary on *Geo.* I. 110 'scatebrisque arentia temperat arua.' Goetz punctuates 'Temperat rusticus scilicet scatebris.' But Serv. 'Dan.' has the note 'Temperat: rusticus scilicet,' and 'scatebris' seems clearly a new lemma. This third note presents an etymology of 'excetra,' as if 'exscat-.' (Serv. on *Aen.* VI. 287 connects it with 'exresco.') If Serv. 'Dan.' is Donatus, this third note with its reference to Plautus may suggest Donatus also (cf. Lindsay, *C.Q.* XI. 128). In his work it would no doubt stand before the note on 'temperat,' but not necessarily, since his commentary too was a 'uariorum' affair.

244, 24 'Sibila ora: pro sibilant<ia> Sallustius "cohortes festinas conposuerat." So *Thes. Gloss.* A note on *Aen.* II. 211. Cf. Servius. But after 'sibilantia' insert 'ut festina pro festinans.' Cf. Serv. 'Dan.' on *Aen.* IX. 486.

245, 22 'Spiram: spira proprie funis nauticus tortus, generis feminini secundum Homerum.' The first part of this belongs to *Geo.* II. 154. The second seems to be a note on the gender of 'funis.' If Hagen is right in reading 'Verrius' for 'Homerus' at several places in the Berne Scholia on Virgil (Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher*, 4th Suppl. Vol. p. 716), we should probably read here '<Funis> generis feminini secundum Verrium'; for, as I hope to show in detail, the same 'uariorum' commentary of which the Berne Scholia on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* are an extract is also the source of the Virgil items of the Abstrusa 'Major.' But there is something to be said for 'Homerum.' Gellius 13, 20 and Nonius 205, 22 (M) quote for 'funis' fem. (but without remark) Lucretius 2, 1154, where 'aurea funis' = *αυρή χρυσή*, *Il.* VIII. 19 (so Munro). Lucretius is certainly sometimes quoted by the authors of the scholia from which the glossary was compiled. We might then read 'Funem Lucretius dixit generis feminini secundum Homerum,' i.e. because he was translating Homer's phrase.

In e
'demi
occasion
dixit:
Rudente
was subj
followed
to the lo
derived fr
stand tog
MS. woul
might tak
'funis.'
supellex,
occasion t
Lib. Gloss
tioned) w
feminini
course, th
but from
sources.
piler of A
meaning.
item is ag
252, 2
capax auc
omnis hu
Read 'uel
'uentris p
'proluuies
significata
252, 2
alibi uerbe
'alibi.'
uincti.' T
here, wher
plural. R
253, 1
ferrum sol
Goetz ques
proposes '
extimo ten

In either case the note on 'funis' might be found at *Aen.* II. 262 'demissum funem,' just as *Aen.* III. 267 'excussos rudentes' may have given occasion for the note (*Lib. Gloss.* 241, 22) 'Rudentem Plautus genere feminino dixit: "dum ergo tibi hanc quam trahis rudentem complico" in fabula Rudente.' Cf. Nonius 221, 30 (M). If, at some stage before Abstrusa Major was subjected to alphabetical arrangement, this 'funem' or 'funis' gloss followed the 'spiram' item, the occurrence of 'funis' in the latter might lead to the loss of the lemma. If, however, these are really two distinct glosses derived from marginalia in a Virgil MS., it is hard to see how they could ever stand together in the glossary, for the places at which they occurred in the MS. would be widely separate. On the other hand, an expansive commentator might take the opportunity of his note on 'spiram' to add this remark about 'funis.' A similar case may be found in Servius on *Geo.* I. 165 'Celei supellex,' where he defines *supellex* as 'qualos, corbes et cetera,' and then takes occasion to add a note on the gender of 'corbis.' It is likely therefore that the *Lib. Gloss.* item comes from one place, not two. To *Geo.* I. 165 (just mentioned) we may refer another gender-note, *Lib. Gloss.* 185, 25: 'Corbos feminini generis dicit esse Donatus,' reading 'corbes.' It is possible, of course, that these gender items come not from the 'uariorum' commentary, but from some list of 'dubia genera' compiled out of Donatus and other sources. Some of these grammarians' lists may have been used by the compiler of Abstrusa, e.g. a list of words spelt alike or nearly alike, but differing in meaning. But there are plenty of such notes in Servius, and the 'spiram' item is against such a supposition.

252, 21 'Ventris proluuies ab stercore fluxu dicitur, proluuies autem uel capax audita (auditas? Goetz) faucium uel fluxus uentris intellegitur; nam omnis humor intra corpus proluuies dicitur, ut "pleno se proluit auro." Read 'uel capax <uenter uel> auditas.' Cf. Serv. 'Dan.' on *Aen.* III. 217 'uentris proluuies: per hoc nimiam edacitatem ostendit, et quidam uolunt "proluuies," cum stercus uentris significet, a Vergilio hoc loco figuram uentris significatam, ergo quasi sannosum et panticosum uentrem.'

252, 26 'Verbenae: sacrae frondes ut laurus, olea, myrtus, poeta aut alibi uerbenae inueni.' Goetz reads 'poeta autem' and marks a lacuna before 'alibi.' The first part is in Servius on *Aen.* XII. 120 'uerbena tempora uincti.' The second was evidently a remark on the occurrence of the singular here, whereas elsewhere (*Ecl.* VIII. 65, *Geo.* IV. 131) Virgil always has the plural. Read 'inueni<tur>'

253, 11 'Veruti: gens a genere teli (Goetz, caeli *codd.*) nouati in quo ferrum solidum est atque productum.' (*Geo.* II. 168 'Volcosque uerutos.') Goetz questions 'nouati,' and Niedermann (*Contr. à la critique des gloses latines*) proposes 'tenuati,' comparing *C.G.L.* 648, 39 Verutum missile angulatum et in extimo tenuatum in formam subulae, a ueru dictum. But 'nouati' may be right.

H. J. THOMSON.

THE MIRACLE OF THE WINE AT DIONYSOS' ADVENT; ON THE LENAEA FESTIVAL.

DURING the period from December to April Dionysos is celebrated at Athens four times: at the Lesser Dionysia, at the Lenaea, at the Anthesteria, at the Greater Dionysia.

The Lenaea festival falls in the Ionic month of Lenaion, which corresponds with the Attic Gamelion, i.e. January. There are no serious objections to fixing the date in this way. The competition in theatricals held at this festival is called *ὁ ἐπὶ Ληναίων ἀγών*; the god Dionysos *Ληναῖος* or *Ληνεύς*; the temple-grounds *τὸ Λήναιον*. These were probably situated on the stretch of swelling ground, rising from the Apostle Paul Road, between Areopagus and Akropolis, as there was room enough there to seat a large audience. It is worthy of notice that, in contrast with the Greater or Urban Dionysia, ancient narrators call the Lenaea a rural festivity,¹ at which a rustic song is intoned. Still, they are to be distinguished from the Lesser Dionysia, which are celebrated at the end of December.²

Besides the competition in dramatic representation, the Lenaea offers a procession. The *ἄρχων βασιλεύς* conducts the competition and, together with epimeletes, the procession. But then the festival is said to bear a mystic character. A *δαιδούχος* appears, who, brandishing a torch, invites the audience to invoke the god: *καλεῖτε τὸν θεόν!* The audience then calls: 'Iakchos, son of Semele, bearer of wealth—*Σεμελῆς Ἰακχε πλουτοδότα!*' As this invocation takes place under torchlight, it needs must occur at night.

To what end, now, is Dionysos invited? What riches is he expected to bestow? An inscription of the isle of Mykonos³ proves the sacrifice to Dionysos Leneus there to have been combined with one to Zeus Chthonios and Ge Chthonia, after Semele had been tendered an offering the day before. Hence we are among the chthonic powers of fruitfulness. It is as such that Dionysos is to manifest himself. He will have to prove his power as the god of vegetation.

Now the spring Dionysia are connected with the making of the wine. Already at the Lenaea, the yet unracked wine, the product of the first fermentation, is partaken of. Probably the god is invoked by all means

¹ Schol. *Ar. Ach.* 504; Steph. Byz. s.v. *Ληναῖος*; Clem. Al. *Protr.* 3.

² Theophr. *Char.* XVIII.

³ Dittenb. *Syll.* 2 615, 25.

T
liberally
night fo
Th
called
Maenad
superse
antiqui
name, c
surface
Heraion
Lenaio
Lenai—
where t
are deri
more li
strange
Doric λ
Dio
who an
is suppo
us, so t
narrates
flows in
enlarge
wine flo
if this li
e fonte
e consp
Wi
is what
The go
VI. 26,
that wit
own ac
naturall
Ro
Andros.
minds,
as long
Baccha
ἀρύττοντ
Mus. N.
¹ Diels,
² Hesyl

liberally to bestow this very boon. But in what way? What happens in the night following the invocation?

The god appears, but not alone. He is accompanied by nymphs who are called Lenae (Λῆναι). This name, which is equivalent to those of Bacchae, Maenads, Thyiads, ever and anon appears in Herakleitos¹ perhaps, but is superseded in the classic times by the familiar name of Bacchae. Lenae, so antiquity tells us, is a term from Arcadia for Bacchae.² Hence it is a foreign name, clinging to the words Ληναῖος and Λῆναιον, but disappearing below the surface in the urban language, in the language of scholastic learning. As Heraion from Hera, Limnaion from Limnai, Brisaïos (or Briseus, comp. Leneios besides Leneus) from Brisa, we shall derive Lenaion and Leneios from Lenai—the sanctuary, the god of the Lenai. It is not from ληνός, i.e. the spot where the grapes are trampled under foot 'kelter,' that Lenaion and Leneios are derived, as the spelling Leneion and Leneios would then have been much more likely.³ Lenae, itself, is directly connected with ληνός, it is true; but it is strange that the form Λῆναι should never occur as Λᾶναι, whereas ληνός has a Doric λανός beside it. Still, the word is sporadically met with, as we have said.

Dionysos, the god of the Lenae, appears in the Sanctuary of the Lenae, who are themselves the nymphs of the winepress. The mystic wonder is supposed to take place now. But what wonder no Athenian tradition tells us, so that we must look elsewhere for elucidation. Plinius *N.H.* II. § 231 narrates: 'On the Nones of January a source, the water of which smells of wine, flows in the temple of Bacchus on the Isle of Andros.' This information is enlarged upon in Plinius XXX. 1 § 16 in the following way: 'On Andros wine flows from the source of Dionysos on seven days consecrated to the god; if this liquid be taken outside the temple, the taste changes into water. ('Andri e fonte Liberi Patris statis diebus septenis eius dei uinum fluere; si auferatur e conspectu templi sapor in aquam transeunte').

Wine flows on seven days—outside the temple it changes into water. This is what the masses believe. The god manifests himself. It is a theodaisia. The god, invoked to share the revels, lavishly sheds his gift. Pausanias VI. 26, 2 acquiesces in Plinius' information: 'The inhabitants of Andros tell that with them, at the festival of Dionysos, wine flows from the temple of its own accord'—At 'the festival of Dionysos.' At this time of the year we naturally think of the Lenaia.⁴

Ross, in his *Inselreisen*, scoffs at the credulity of the inhabitants of Andros. When they came outside the temple the cool seawind cleared their minds, so that they no longer mistook water for wine. This may be true; still, as long as they remain within the temple, people are in the condition of Plato's Bacchae (*Ion* 534 A), who, in ecstasy, draw honey and milk from the rivers: ἀρύττονται ἐκ τῶν ποταμῶν μέλι καὶ γάλα κατεχόμεναι. Curtius relates: (*Rhein. Mus.* N. F. II. p. 98) how he saw on the isle of Andros in the flourishing valley

¹ Diels, *Vorsohr.* I. p. 81.

² Hesych. s. v.

³ In spite of exceptions, as Λυκαῖος, Πτολεμαῖος.

⁴ Comp. Usener, *Progr.* Bonn, 1877, p. 24.

of Mesovia, a pierced rock, whence Dionysos' wine was said to flow on festive days. The miracle must have made a deep impression, since its echo is heard down to our present days.

Nor is this the only instance. The inhabitants of Teos were convinced that Dionysos was born with them, as a source of particularly aromatic wine was seen to flow within the town on special days: *τεταγμένοις χρόνοις*. 'Within the town,' and 'on special days,' point to a festival and to a Dionysos sanctuary; probably at the Lenaea, which festival was of so much importance to the Ionians, that they called a full month after it. The miracle took place down to the Christian era.¹

And now an information from the precincts of Elis. At a Dionysos festival, which is held at a quarter of an hour's distance from the town, priests bring three empty kettles into a room; after the kettles have been put down before the eyes of the citizens and foreigners, the door is shut and sealed. Anyone having a mind to do so may help seal. The seals are examined the day after. The door is opened, and the kettles are found to be filled with wine. Dionysos' epiphany!²

It was a rural festivity, since it was celebrated at a distance of eight stadia from the town. The Lenaea, too, goes by the name of rural. In Elis it is called Thyia, and Thyiads are Bacchae or Lenae. According to Plutarchus it is as a being of fruitfulness that the god is invoked to appear with his nymphs here: *ἥρως ἄξιε ταῦπε!* (This *ἄξιος* was erroneously emended away by Cobet; the same adjective is found in the names of the Samothracian demons Axiokersos and Axiokersa.)³ The Eleatic Dionysos, moreover, is called son of Semele in the 34th Homeric hymn, just as he is invoked as Semele's son at the Attic Lenaea.

Similarity enough to conclude that the epiphany of Semele's son is manifested through a miracle of the wine, whether by water being changed into wine, or by empty casks being filled with wine. Our thoughts stray to the miracle of the wine at the marriage of Cana, which, according to *Ev. Joh. 2. 13*, likewise took place in early spring, some time before the Jews' Passover. The Dionysos tradition is at work here. Nay it is even alive in the Rhine provinces when, at the eve of Saint Martin, the children set jugs of water and sing:

'Marteine, Marteine,
Mach das Wasser zu Weine!'⁴

At the Lenaea the god probably appeared with his Lenae, and during the night set to work making wine on the spot which had been reserved for it, the *ληνός*. The priests showed the miracle, and spent the gift among the greatly impressed onlookers. Are not at Pellene in Achaia, too, the torches lit in the temple of Dionysos *Λαμπτήρ* during the night, after which the full casks are set all over the town?⁵ At the arrival of Dionysos, the vines are covered with

¹ Diod. Sic. III. 66: τὸ μέλι τοῦ οἴνου.

² Paus. VI. 26, 1; Athen. I. 34 A.; Aristot. *θauμ.* *ἀκ.* 123; Weniger, *Ueber d. Kolleg. der Sechsz.* p. 13; Plut. *Quaest. Gr.* 299 A.

³ Welcker, *Gr. Gött.* II. p. 598.

⁴ J. W. Wolf, *Beiträge z. d. Myth.* I. 45; Reinsberg-Düringsfeld, *Das festl. Jahr.* p. 342.

⁵ Paus. VII. 27, 3.

ripe fruit
sings a hy
The mirac
fermentati
at the my
the events
and allow
its rocks?
the Silen
of Nikaia
to Dionys
of Kissous
the nympl
stroke of t

We a
above, is
should thi
king Asios
cuncta in
maidens i
verb for
'keltern'

Oivon
devoted to
in literatu
cyclus, is
Agamemn
fetch them

The A
makers, th
festival be
slumbers
To be sur
as these l
who have
originally
a kind of
Bauernwin
Ueberfluss

¹ In the 7
Soph. Ant. 11

² Philostr.

³ The myt

⁴ Plut. *Ly.*

⁵ *Metam.* X

ripe fruit in one day, according to Schol. *Il. N.* 21, during which the multitude sings a hymn; and there is plenty of wine in the evening of that selfsame day. The miracle shows twofold here: the ripening of the fruit and the completed fermentation in one single day. This is said by Sophocles to have happened at the mystic Euboia.¹ And does not the miracle of the advent culminate in the events of the first advent of Dionysos, his birth, when the earth rejoices and allows wine to be drawn from its sources, while it causes milk to flow from its rocks?² Is not the miracle of the wine seen in the myth of Silenos, when the Silen's mind is clouded by the liquid from the source; or in the myth of Nikaia who, caught by the treacherous water (*ἀπατήλιον ὕδωρ*) falls a prey to Dionysos?³ Again, does not the same representation show when the source of Kissousa at Haliartos tastes of wine after Dionysos has been bathed in it by the nymphs?⁴ In Euripides' *Bacchae*, the wine spouts under the Bacchante's stroke of the narthex, as it does in Auerbach's *Keller*. They, too, are Lenae.

We are dealing with a very old superstition here, which, as was shown above, is still living on in the miracle of Christ. It is much older than we should think. The Lenae lie hid in the mythological daughters of the Delian king Asios, who, by their touch, could change water into wine: 'nam tactu cuncta in laticem meri transformabantur,' sings Ovidius.⁵ The name of these maidens is *Οἰνοτρόποι*. *Τραπεῶ*, now, is already in *Odys. η* 125, the typical verb for pressing the wine. *Οἶνος τραπεητός* is must (Hesych. s. v.), and 'keltern' is expressed by the Greek through two verbs *τραπεῖν καὶ πατεῖν*.⁶

Οἰνοτρόποι means wine-makers. These maidens who were said to be devoted to Dionysos⁷ were Lenae, to be sure. And where are they met with in literature for the first time? In the ancient song which, in the Homeric cyclus, is indicated as Kypria. When the Grecian army before Troy is in need, Agamemnon invokes the help of these maidens; Odysseus and Menelaos go to fetch them from Delos.⁸

The *Αἰῆναι* help Dionysos to perform the miracle. It is to them, the wine-makers, that the sanctuary named Lenaion is consecrated. Hence the Lenaea festival belongs to them, together with Dionysos, whose miraculous power slumbers also in them. Is it because his power has been transmitted to them? To be sure, but not in the same way as Bacchae, Thyiads and Maenads have it, as these latter are *ab origine* connected with Dionysos. The Arcadian Lenae, who have devoted themselves to Dionysos, constitute a group, which was originally *foreign* to the Thracian daimon. In Arcadia they may have been a kind of *Selige Fräulein*, who, as Mannhardt has it: 'hilfreich sind in der Bauernwirtschaft und, wo sie weilen und schaffen, stellt sich Segen und Ueberfluss ein.'⁹ From the South they found their way into Attica, and there,

¹ In the *Thyestes*, Fr. 234 N; comp. Schol. *Soph. Ant.* 1133.

² Philostr. *Imag.* I. 14 and 785.

³ The myth of Nikaia and of Aura in Nonnos.

⁴ Plut. *Lys.* 28.

⁵ *Metam.* XIII. 632.

⁶ Athen. VII. 282 B (Ananios); comp. Fick in *Bezenb. Beitr.* XXVIII. (1904), p. 106.

⁷ Serv. *Ann.* III. 80.

⁸ Kink, *Ep. Gr. Fr.* p. 29; comp. also Schol. § 164. Simonides poetized it anew.

⁹ *Wald- und Feldkulte*, p. 103.

96 THE MIRACLE OF THE WINE AT DIONYSOS' ADVENT

too, got a rural festival with a sanctuary of their own. That they should be drawn within the circle of Dionysos was inevitable. To what extent they originally predominated is shown by the epithet 'Dionysos of the Lenae.' Gradually identified with Bacchae, their name was superseded by this more general appellation and disappeared from literature, not to be restored until the days of the Hellenistic learning. Names like this, drawn forth from the life and the creed of antiquity, were very much sought after in Alexandrian poetry. They belong to Theocritus' *ὀλίγα ἔξωθεν*: the 21st *Idyll* was piquantly named *Λῆναι ἢ Βάκχαι*; the name had to be explained to the unlettered. Hence *ἢ Βάκχαι* in addition to it.

One observation more. The fable that Dionysos' progress meant the distribution of the vine has long since been rejected as false. Long before Dionysos made his appearance in Hellas and Italy, the grape was known there. The prehistoric graves of Orchomenos and the pile houses of the valley of the Po, on examination, showed stones of grapes among their refuse. No more does Dionysos' arrival mean the budding knowledge of wine-making. Dionysos does not yet act a part in the Homeric Olympus, and is only a god *in statu nascendi* to the Homeric hero, when the latter is already equally well versed in swinging the full goblet as in handling the sword. If it should be necessary to prove that Hellas made wine before the Thracian daimon descended from the mountains, the Arcadian Lenae are there to bear testimony. So may the march of civilization be traced by means of mythology.

UNIVERSITY OF LEYDEN.

J. VÜRTHEIM.

DR. HO

WHIL
Roman cal
the astron
Julian Cal
47. That
edition of

In the
regarded th
that the s
a. d. V. Ka
muster of
on the eve
Dr. Holme
Groebe's s
cites from
interval be
that F. J. S
three hour
is about t
experience
The last st
'rarely' an
more often
to Judeich
to be accep
entitled 'C
expressed
which Gro
new moon
25.7 hour
especially
the setting
at least 12
in the case
moon stoo
refraction
weather to

¹ Caesar,

² Caesar in

³ Monthly
Society, LXX

ASTRONOMICAL COMMENTS ON

DR. HOLMES'S NOTE ON THE JULIAN CALENDAR.

WHILE reserving my judgment on the wider questions connected with the Roman calendar, I think it may not be out of place to attempt a firmer handling of the astronomical dates discussed in Dr. Rice Holmes's 'Supplementary Note on the Julian Calendar' which appeared in the *CLASSICAL QUARTERLY*, XIV. (1920), pp. 46, 47. That note is concerned with two new moons discussed by Dr. Groebe in his edition of Drumann's *Geschichte Roms*, III. (1906), pp. 774-9.

In the first of these Groebe cites two passages¹ to prove that the Germans regarded the new moon as a lucky time for a meeting or an enterprise, and assumes that the same idea was current among the Helvetii. He infers that the date, a. d. V. Kal. Apr. (March 28, 696), which, as Caesar states, had been fixed for the muster of the Helvetii on the Rhone, corresponded to the Julian March 25, 58 B.C., on the evening of which day the crescent of the moon should have become visible. Dr. Holmes denies that the moon could have been seen that evening. He accepts Groebe's statement that the moon was new on the Julian March 24 at 4.40 p.m., and cites from Groebe that the Babylonian tablets of the third century B.C. make the interval between new moon and first visibility vary from nineteen to fifty hours, and that F. J. Schmidt's observations at Athens made it vary from twenty-nine to sixty-three hours. He attributes to Judeich² the view that the earliest moment of visibility is about thirty-three hours after new moon, and to every observant person the experience that the crescent is rarely discernible until two days after new moon. The last statement can only be justified if we give a wide meaning both to the word 'rarely' and to the phrase 'two days.' It would be correct to say that the interval more often than not exceeds a day and a half. I cannot find the statement attributed to Judeich; but Judeich's calculations of the visibility of the moon are not worthy to be accepted as models. Schmidt's observations were analyzed by me in a paper entitled 'On the Smallest Visible Phase of the Moon,'³ and, though I have not expressed the result in terms of the moon's age, it agrees very well with the conclusion which Groebe cites from the Babylonian tablets. The shortest interval between a new moon and the observation of the moon by Schmidt's naked eye comes to 25.7 hours, but the same astronomical conditions will often be realized more quickly, especially in March. In my paper I found that if the moon stands vertically above the setting sun, she should be visible the same evening on the condition that she is at least 12 degrees above the horizon at sunset, parallax and refraction being ignored in the case of both luminaries. Now I find that on the Julian March 25, 58 B.C., the moon stood 14 degrees vertically above the setting sun at Geneva, parallax and refraction being ignored as in my paper. The moon ought, therefore, in normal weather to have been visible that evening, and Groebe is fairly entitled to say that the

¹ Caesar, *B.G.* I. 50, 5, and Tacitus, *Germ.* II.

² *Caesar im Orient* (1885), pp. 107 note, 108.

³ *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, LXX. (1910), pp. 527-31. The result of

this investigation is also to be found in Ginzel, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, II. (1911), p. 318.

first appearance of the new moon was on the evening of the day which he equates with a. d. V. Kal. Apr.

But the question whether the moon was visible that evening is really irrelevant, for Caesar makes it clear that the date was fixed in advance. If, therefore, there is anything in Groebe's supposition, we have not to inquire on which evening the moon was first visible, but on which evening she could be expected to be visible. In all probability the Helvetii could not compute the day of the appearance of the moon by any more exact method than the simple rule that the first appearance each month would be either twenty-nine or thirty days after the first appearance in the preceding month. That appearance should have been in the evening of the Julian February 24; so that the first day on which the crescent of the next moon could be expected would be twenty-nine days later, the Julian March 25, the day which Groebe desiderates.¹

But, of course, it is a mere assumption that the muster was fixed for the day when the crescent was expected to appear, and there is no reason why it should not have been fixed for the previous day or for an entirely different part of the month, if that suits the chronology better.

The second date on which Dr. Holmes joins issue with Groebe must be decided in Dr. Holmes's favour. The moon, which was new on the early morning of January 2, 45 B.C., would certainly not be visible that evening. But we must remember that the Julian calendar was framed under expert astronomical advice, and the Greek astronomical calendars invariably aim at making the calendar month begin not with the true new moon nor with the appearance of the crescent, but with the mean new moon. Now the mean new moon at the beginning of 45 B.C. fell, according to my computation, on January 1 at 6.27 p.m. Mid-European time. Caesar's advisers were probably able to fix it somewhere within an hour of that time. It is therefore probable that I was right in the suggestion which I made in a juvenile and otherwise worthless paper to which Dr. Holmes refers that Caesar calculated the new moon for January 1 of that year, and that this calculation determined the inaugural day of the Julian calendar. Another reason, often expressed along with other conjectures of doubtful value, confirms me in the same belief. The literary evidence goes to show that Caesar's calendar was planned in Egypt, and was based on Egyptian science.² Whether his adviser Sosigenes was an Egyptian is a disputed question. It was the Egyptian custom to determine the dates of annual phenomena by reference to the date of the heliacal rising of Sirius; this date, when expressed in terms of the Egyptian vague year of 365 days, varied by one day in four years. And it is interesting to observe that Caesar's almanack appears to have fixed the heliacal rising of that star for July 18,³ a date which would hold good for a part of Egypt, but which was far out for Italy. Any rule for predicting this phenomenon would have to make it recur in three successive years at intervals of 365 days, and in a fourth year at an interval of 366 days, and it may be assumed that any purely solar calendar planned under Egyptian influence would endeavour to fix this phenomenon to a particular day of the calendar year. If we assume that the phenomenon was intended to occupy a fixed place in the Julian calendar, and also in the Alexandrian calendar established by Augustus in Egypt, we find that both calendars place the 366 days' interval in the same year, both making it end in the

¹ On p. 47, line 2, of Dr. Holmes's paper, '26th' is clearly a misprint for '25th.'

² See Lucan, X. 185, etc.; Appian, *Bell. Cin.* II. 154; Cassius Dio, XLIII. 26; Macrobius, *Sat. I.* 14, 3, and 16, 39.

³ This is the date in Pliny, II. 123, XVIII. 269 (reading *postridie*), 270. Varro, *R.R.* I. 28,

makes it twenty-seven days after the solstice, i.e. July 21, also an Egyptian date. Some, but not all, of the various Egyptian dates for this phenomenon will be found in Ginzel, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie* (1906), pp. 188, 189.

July of a Julian year, the advice of keeping the calendar whatever was have been a leap year, after Augustus, views of the same phenomenon.

IN Dr. Holmes's paper, in the *Classical Review*.

July of a Julian leap year. I have no doubt that both calendars were framed under the advice of the same school of astronomers, and that Caesar's calendar aimed at keeping the heliacal rising of Sirius as computed by that school fixed to July 18 or whatever was his published date for the phenomenon. If so, the year 45 B.C. must have been arranged in exact conformity with the rule which held good continuously after Augustus's rectification of the calendar, and the new calendar began with a leap year, because the heliacal rising of Sirius in 45 B.C. was, according to the views of the astronomical school which Caesar followed, 366 days later than the same phenomenon in 46 B.C.

J. K. FOTHERINGHAM.

CORRIGENDVM.

IN Dr. T. Rice Holmes's article, 'A Supplementary Note on the Julian Calendar' in the *Classical Quarterly* of January, 1920, the following correction should be made:

P. 47, l. 2: For '26th' read '25th.'

48139A

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

Berliner philologische Wochenschrift. 1919.

Aug. 23. W. Bacher, *De Pausaniae studiis Homericis* (Helck). A good collection of material. A. Frickenhaus, *Die altgriechische Bühne*. Illustrated (Lenschau). A valuable study of the structure of the stage at Athens and elsewhere down to the first century B.C.

Sept. 6. M. Pohlenz, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanae disputationes*, rec. M. P. (Philippson). This new Teubner text is very highly praised. There are two indices, the second of Greek technical terms. The editio minor includes the indices but not the valuable introduction. Tolkiehn contributes to this number 'Schedae criticae,' in which he proposes to read in Soph. *El.* 174 ἐνι μέγας οὐρανῷ, and in Eur. *Or.* 86 σὺ δὲ μακάριε μακάριός θ' ὁ σὺς πόρις with no stop at the end of the line.

Sept. 13. Ed. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompeius* (Hohl). The reviewer expresses great admiration for this elaborate work (627 pages), but disagrees with the main thesis, viz. that Pompeius and not Caesar was the founder of the principate. A. Süsskand contributes to this number a paper entitled *Einführung in die Eumeniden des Aischylos*, in which he discusses at length the moral problem and the structure of the play.

Sept. 20. R. Heinze, *Die lyrischen Verse des Horaz* (K. P. Schulze). Opposed to the views of Christ and Kiessling. Horace composed freely, guided by his own artistic feeling, not by the rules prescribed by others. Fr. Schöll, *Über die Haupthandschrift [Vaticanus Basilicanus H 25] von Ciceros Philippiken nebst Bemerkungen zu Stellen dieser Reden* (Klotz). A valuable supplement to the app. crit. of Schöll's text. The reviewer discusses the reading of a few passages. J. Hirschberg, *Geschichte der Augenheilkunde*. Register-Band (Kind). This forms part of Graefe-Saemisch, *Handbuch der gesamten Augenheilkunde*, to which J. H. contributed the historical part.

Sept. 27. L. Radermacher, *Beiträge zur Volkskunde aus dem Gebiet der Antike* (Tittel). Throws new light on a number of difficult questions. B. Michael contributes to this number an interesting paper on Aristotle's doctrine of κάθαρσις; he discusses the text and interpretation of Pol. 1340a 12 sqq. and 1342a 7 sqq.

Oct. 4. J. H. Lipsius in this number discusses afresh the authorship of *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. His main argument may be briefly summarized as follows: 1. The author is either Ephorus or Cratippus. 2. Ephorus made use of the work of Cratippus. 3. The fragments recently published in vol. 13 of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* are by Ephorus, as Grenfell shows. 4. Diodorus uses the very words of these fragments in several sentences. He must, therefore, have had the work of Ephorus before him. 5. There is not the same correspondence between Diodorus and *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. The latter is, therefore, not part of the work of Ephorus, but is by Cratippus.

Oct. 11. A. v. Domaszewski, *Die Konsulate der römischen Kaiser* (Lammert). The author comes to the conclusion that 'the imperium of the Princeps was derived from the consulship not the proconsulship.'

Oct. 18. A Ludwig contributes a paper on the *Paraphrase eines Gedichtes über den Raub der Persephone*. This is the title of a fragmentary text edited by F. Buecheler in the *Berliner Klassikertexte* (V. 1, pp. 7 sqq.) in 1907. It is copied from a papyrus

ascribed to t
derived from
quensis. Lu

Oct. 25.
lateinischen
Ozeanländer
free from fau

Nov. 1.
careful work.

Nov. 8.
Der Name.
Griechen (K.
death.

Nov. 15.
A model dis
Resp. Lac. 12
proposes an
on Cassius K

Nov. 22.
continued in
Karà Στεφάνω

Nov. 29.
A second ec
Kyzikos (B.

Dec. 6.
A long revi
in 'philolog
differences
his *Cruces* 7
Romae is so
VIII. 11, 4,
interemptio.

Dec. 13.
1887-9. Th
epic diction
(Tittel). A
E. Wagner
what misin

Dec. 20.
and date, th
Crispi Catil
the app. cri
next issue
critical and

Dec. 27.
on art, larg

Classical

Oct. 1.
Lucretius,
Late Roman
with full de
developme

ascribed to the first century B.C., and is of interest because it is in many parts derived from the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, preserved only in the Codex Mosquensis. Ludwig attempts to restore the text completely.

Oct. 25. H. Philipp, *Pomponius Mela Geographie des Erdkreises*, aus dem lateinischen übersetzt und erläutert von H. P. I. Teil: Mittelmeerländer. II. Teil: Ozeanländer (Capelle). Both the translation and commentary, though by no means free from faults, are valuable.

Nov. 1. L. Hugl, *Der Antiochikos des Libanios* (Richtsteig). Thorough and careful work.

Nov. 8. C. Favez, *L. Annaei Senecae ad Helviam matrem* (Hosius). R. Hirzel, *Der Name*. Ein Beitrag zu seiner Geschichte im Altertum und besonders bei den Griechen (K. Fr. W. Schmidt). A valuable treatise left unfinished at the author's death.

Nov. 15. R. Herzog, *Aus der Geschichte des Bankwesens im Altertum* (Steinert). A model dissertation. Contributions: Th. Thalheim, emendations on Xenophon, *Resp. Lac.* IX. 1, X. 4, XI. 5, XIII. 9; *Hipp.* V. 9, VII. 14, VIII. 8. F. Harder proposes *anteride* for *ariete* in Caesar, *B.G.* IV. 17, 9. G. Helmreich, critical notes on Cassius Felix, cc. 21, 82, and Caelius Aurelianus, *Chron.* II. 3, § 66; 4, §§ 71, 74.

Nov. 22. H. Schucht contributes *Über die Echtheit attischer Rednerurkunden*, continued in next issue. He holds as spurious the documents in Demosthenes, *Katà Στεφάνου*, I. 28, 31; II. 14, 21.

Nov. 29. Fr. Boll u. C. Bezold, *Sternglaube und Sterndeutung* (B. A. Müller). A second edition, slightly enlarged. H. v. Fritze, *Die autonome Kupferprägung von Kyzikos* (B. A. Müller). 'A very profound and fruitful investigation.'

Dec. 6. C. F. G. Heinrich, *Die Hermes-Mystik und das Neue Testament* (Posselt). A long review, continued in next issue. H. is weak in method, very ill equipped in 'philology,' and inconsistent on the main issues; but he writes well on the differences between 'Hermesmystik' and early Christianity. A. Kurfess continues his *Cruces Tullianae*. *Ad Att.* V. 2, 3, for *operare* read *operae reare*; V. 19, 2, *iam Romae* is sound; VII. 22, 2, read *Recte sit: censeo cedendum*. *De Oppii* (Boot) *iis*; VIII. 11, 4, read *aestate atque autumno utriusque magnis copiis in municipiis . . . nec tam interemptio . . . quam universae v. p. interitus*.

Dec. 13. J. van Leeuwen, *Ilias* (Cauer). A revision of the critical edition of 1887-9. The account of MSS. and papyri is good; but van L.'s unitary theory of epic diction mars his use of them. Fr. Boll, *Antike Beobachtungen farbiger Sterne* (Tittel). A valuable study, from Greek texts, of Babylonian observations. E. Wagner contributes *Zum Schilde des Achilleus*. In the city-scenes the poet somewhat misinterprets frieze-work which he has seen.

Dec. 20. E. Bethe, *Die Ichneutai des Sophokles* (Bucherer). Treats of staging and date, the lost beginning, etc. Praised on the whole. A. W. Ahlberg, *C. Sallusti Crispi Catilina*, etc. (Klotz). A useful critical edition. The text is conservative, and the app. crit. better than Jordan's. Klotz criticizes many details. In this and the next issue E. Drerup, *Die Zeit unserer Ilias*, controverts at length Bethe's views, critical and other, on *Il.* VI. 297-303.

Dec. 27. R. Pagenstecher, *Alexandrinische Studien* (Herrmann). Three essays on art, largely approved.

Classical Weekly. New York. 1919.

Oct. 1. C. K. contributes to this and three following numbers an Analysis of Lucretius, *De rerum natura* I.-III. Review: W. Dennison, *A Gold Treasure of the Late Roman Period from Egypt* (J. Shapley). 'A beautiful series of reproductions with full description. . . . It remains for us to relate this material to the general development of Early Christian art.'

Oct. 20. G. W. Leffingwell, *Social and Private Life at Rome in the Time of Plautus and Terence* (A. L. Wheeler). This doctoral dissertation 'will be of some use as a partial summary of the material on private life in Plautus, Terence, Cato, Polybius, etc., but the reader will have to determine in a very large number of instances whether the details were, in the time of Plautus and Terence, Greek or Roman.'

Nov. 17. W. W. Blancké, *The Dramatic Values in Plautus* (E. S. McCartney). 'From a mass of evidence it is deduced . . . that his plays were professedly mere entertainment . . .; by placing them low in the dramatic scale we obviate the necessity of explaining unrealities and absurdities.'

Dec. 15. B. R. Burchett, *Janus in Roman Life and Cult*. A study in Roman Religion (J. W. Hewitt). The writer 'emphasizes the paucity of real information which we possess about this puzzling deity.' Her dissertation affords a handy conspectus of our knowledge. J. P. Postgate, *M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Ciuili Liber VIII.*, ed. by J.P.P. (G. M. Hirst). 'The Introduction is interesting and valuable . . ., the notes are very good . . ., altogether a valuable addition to the somewhat scanty number of works in English on Lucan.'

1920. Jan. 5. M. E. Armstrong, *The Significance of Certain Colours in Roman Ritual* (G. D. Hadzsits). M. Platnauer, *The Life and Reign of the Emperor Lucius Septimius Severus* (A. E. R. Boak). 'A contribution signalled by independence of judgment, a thorough knowledge of the sources, and a careful discussion of many of the difficult problems which they present.'

Jan. 12. W. T. Rowland, *On the Position in the Clause of Ne and Ut in certain documents of Colloquial Latin* (A. L. Wheeler). 'He traces this affinity of the particle for the verb to the fact that the particle was originally an adverb, and therefore its proper position was immediately before the verb.'

Jan. 19. C. K. contributes an interesting criticism of Professor Osler's address to the Classical Association. W. H. Kirk has a paper in this and the following number on 'The Accusative of Specification in Latin.' 'To sum up: the perfect participle cannot be transitive unless the verb has a perfect indicative of the compound form (e.g. *indutus*, as in Ovid, *A.A.* 3, 109).' Reviews: C. H. Herford, *The Poetry of Lucretius* (R. B. English). 'This treatise is a strong appeal for a rational and constructive understanding of a much misunderstood and often maligned poet.' W. D. Gray, (1) *A Political Ideal of the Emperor Hadrian*, (2) *A Study of the Life of Hadrian Prior to his Accession* (G. A. Harrer). 'In both these papers a thorough knowledge of the ancient sources and the works of modern scholars is evident.'

Jan. 26. W. E. Leonard, *T. Lucretius Carus, Of the Nature of Things: a metrical translation* (R. B. English). 'All in all this effort . . . is highly successful.' *Index verborum quae in Senecae Fabulis necnon in Octavia Praetexta reperiuntur*, a Guilielmo Abbott Oldfather, Arthuro Stanley Pease, Howardo Vernon Canter confectus (M. N. Wetmore). 'A most valuable contribution to our working libraries.' C. K. Chase, *T. Macci Plauti Rudens*, the text with a translation (G. D. Kellogg). An acting edition. Stage directions are given in the translation.

Mnemosyne. XLVII. 1 (Jan. 1919).

J. C. Naber, *Observatiunculae de Iure Romano* (continued from vol. xlvi. p. 126): *De mensurae generibus—Pars altera (de Urbibus)*, collects a vast mass of evidence respecting the configuration and orientation of ancient cities. K. Kuiper, *De Idomeneo ac Merione*, finds traces in *Iliad* XII.-XVII. of ancient epics dealing with wars waged in the Cretan mountains, in which I. and M. figure as allied leaders. P. H. Damsté has two articles on the textual criticism of Seneca's *Troades* and *Phoenissae* respectively, and C. Brakman one on that of Ammianus. W. Vollgraff, *Studia Epigraphica*, deals with five short inscriptions, of which the most important is

one here published connected with dates it to the Graecia as its instance of the *C. Asinii Polli* three letters with the explanation to take command of the Senate, he discusses the Lyconides' slave eight verses rehandled, and of Megadorus something as maerens?'

Revue d

V. Bérar and emended was made in lists of eponyms by A. Rehm Miletus in 19 for the chronology by P. Lejay *the Site of Rome* A. Biaudet). the year 1918

Rivista

R. Sabbatini and accented then at hand. hexameter-em recent edition the fortunate Virgil lamentations represent Virgil *charmus and the on Theocritus*. but the existence *dota Latina* (Reviews: A. mathematical

XLVII.

V. Costa of the war and E. Cocchia,

one here published; it is inscribed on a small bronze tablet, and contains accounts connected with a granary at Hiera, one of the Lipari islands. V. deciphers it, and dates it to the sixth century B.C. The mixture of Doric and Ionic suggests Magna Graecia as its place of origin, and it is noteworthy as containing the earliest known instance of the use of alphabetical numeral symbols. J. van Wageningen, *De C. Asinii Pollionis ad Antonium transitione*, discusses the Pollio's motive in the light of three letters written by him from Spain to Cicero (*ad fam.* X. 31, 32, 33). W. finds the explanation in the conduct of the Senate which did not summon him from Spain to take command of the war in Italy. Conceiving himself scorned and rejected by the Senate, he turned to an alliance with Antony. P. J. Enk, *De Aulularia Plantina*, discusses the problems presented by the identical names of Megadorus' and Lyconides' slaves, and by the appearance of the character Pythodocus, who has only eight verses assigned to him. E.'s solution is to assume that the play has been rehandled, and that the editor in transferring Eunomia and Lyconides to the house of Megadorus altered the words of Plautus. V. 727 of the play originally read something as follows: 'quinum homo hic ante avunculi aedes eiulans conqueritur maerens?'

Revue de Philologie. XLIII. 2. 1919.

V. Bérard, *Sur le Texte de l'Odyssée*. A large number of passages are discussed and emended. B. Haussoullier, *Inscriptions de Didymes*. An important discovery was made in 1903-1904 in the sanctuary of Apollon Delphinios at Miletus of seven lists of eponymi containing more than four hundred names. They were published by A. Rehm in the third volume of the German account of the excavations at Miletus in 1914. In the present article H. examines the evidence which they afford for the chronology of the accounts for the construction of the *Didymeion*. Reviews by P. Lejay of: E. H. Sturtevant, *Linguistic Change*; W. Warde Fowler, *Aeneas at the Site of Rome*, and *La Vie sociale à Rome* (a translation of F.'s *Social Life at Rome* by A. Biaudet). The summaries of classical periodicals are continued to the end of the year 1918.

Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica. XLVII. 1. January, 1919.

R. Sabbadini, *Excursions in Oratorical Rhythm*. The struggle between quantitative and accentual *clausulae* lasts into the third century, but the triumph of accent is then at hand. Even the grammarian Claudius Sacerdos regards *perspicere possit* as a hexameter-ending. L. Valmagg, *Incerti Poetae Octavia*. Criticisms of Santoro's recent edition. G. Giri, *Virgil's First Eclogue*. Tityrus and Meliboeus are types of the fortunate and of the unfortunate, vividly contrasted and sympathetically portrayed. Virgil's own good fortune is the source of Tityrus' story, while Meliboeus' lamentations are suggested by the actual state of Italy. But Tityrus does not represent Virgil or any other real person. C. Pascal, *The Spurious Works of Epicharmus and the Epicharmus of Ennius*. F. Garin, *Demetrius Triclinius and the Scholia on Theocritus*. There are some good emendations in the genuine scholia of Triclinius; but the existing *Scholia Tricliniana* are very much contaminated. G. Pesenti, *Anecdota Latina* (continued from Vol. XLV. p. 70 sqq.). IV. Herennius Modestinus. Reviews: A. C. Clark, *The Descent of Manuscripts* (R. Sabbadini: 'A monument of mathematical precision, of heroic patience, and of remarkable critical acumen'), etc.

XLVII. 2. April, 1919.

V. Costanzi, *Observations on the Third Samnite War*. Criticizes the Livian account of the war and of the part played by the Lucanians and the Etruscans at that time. E. Cocchia, *The alleged Forgetfulness of Quantity in the Latin Grammarians*. Defends

Claudius Sacerdos against the strictures of Sabbadini (see above). F. Calonghi, *Tibulliana* (continued). F. Garin, *Theocritea*. XV. 77 ἀποκλῆσας 'having shut in' not (as Haupt and others) 'having shut out.' The marginal scholia on *Id.* I.-X., found in Cod. Vat. 913, are to be attributed to Maximus Planudes. T. Tosi, *Notes on Pausanias*. In II. 16. 7 καὶ Ἠλέκτρας, with which the lacuna is commonly filled, gives no sense. The following words show that something like ὁ δὲ Ἠλέκτρας τάφος ἐν τῇ Φωκίδι ἐστίν, ὡς γράφει Ἑλλάνικος preceded, and before that there must have been a sentence stating that Orestes was buried in Arcadia. A. Beltrami, *The Nominative with the Infinitive*. Supplements and partially corrects Kühner-Stegmann. *Videor*, unlike other *verba sentiendi et declarandi*, prefers the personal construction when used with auxiliaries (*uideari possum*, etc.) and in 'abbreviated subordinate clauses' (*ui uideor, qui uideor*, etc.). In the sense of 'seeming good' the personal construction is by no means rare.

Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie. 1919.

Aug. 18. O. Fiebigler and L. Schmidt, *Inscriptensammlung zur Geschichte der Ostgermanen* (Drexel). A miscellaneous collection.

Sept. 1. J. Kaerst, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*. I. 2 Ed. (Cauer). The special aim is to reveal the chain of universal history. O. Rossbach, *Der Rehdigeranus im 31 bis 35 Buch des Livius*. The Rehd. is independent of cod. Bamb. and often more correct.

Sept. 15. U. de Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Aeschyli Tragoediae*. Ed. minor (Koennecke). The reviewer aims at showing by numerous instances that W. is wrong in believing the manuscripts to be seriously corrupt.

Sept. 29. Th. Birt, *Zur Kulturgeschichte Roms*. 3rd Ed. (Cauer). An attractive picture.

Oct. 13. Fr. Koepp, *Archäologie* (Koester). The writer is happy in his venture of giving a general view of the whole field of archaeology in a concise form. A. W. Persson, *Vorstudien zu einer Geschichte der attischen Sakralgesetzgebung* (Drerup). Sound, but without much novelty. M. Bacherler, *Fruticare and fructificare in Tertullian*. B. decides in favour of the latter.

Oct. 27. L. Radermacher, *Beiträge zur Volkskunde aus dem Gebiet der Antike* (Harder).

Nov. 10. Ahmed Djemal, *Alte Denkmäler aus Syrien, Palästina und Westarabien*, published by command of A. D. Pasha (Fiechter). Offers a rich harvest of artistic and scientific material.

Nov. 24. C. Robert, *Archäologische Hermeneutik* (Koepp). James S. McLemore, *The Tradition of the Latin Accent* (Draheim). A valuable collection of instances.

Dec. 22. E. Wymer, *Marktplatzanlagen der Griechen und Römer* (Drexel). Treats specially of the construction of the forum in the Roman provinces, and is written by an architect for architects. M. Schuster, *Studien zur Textkritik des jüngeren Plinius* (Schönberger).

1920. Jan. 5. E. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie und das Prinzipat des Pompeius* (Sternkopf). A welcome contrast to the corresponding part of Mommsen's history. Clear in narrative, logical in arrangement, and objective in judgment, the book is a real pleasure to the reader.

Jan. 19. G. B. Grundy, *Thucydides and the history of his Age* (Widmann). Full of substance. A. W. Spratt, *Thucydides*, Book IV. (Widmann).

Feb. 2. Max Schmidt, *Troika* (Drerup). The conclusion is that Proklos can be thoroughly trusted as to all aspects of the cyclic epos of which he treats. Jos. Martin, *Commedianea* (Stangl). A most valuable examination of all the readings of the eighty *Instructiones*.

. Calonghi,
hut in' not
-X., found
i, *Notes on*
filled, gives
as *τάφος ἐν*
have been
Nominative
n. *Videor*,
when used
auses' (*ut*
struction is

eschichte der

The special
tigeranus im
often more

Ed. minor
that W. is

n attractive

his venture
ncise form.
g (Drerup).
ctificare in

der Antike

Westarabien,
t of artistic

McLemore,
ances.

el). Treats
s written by
geren Plinius

des Pompeius
en's history.
e book is a

ann). Full

oklos can be
Jos. Martin,
of the eighty